

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER, 1904.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE CONSUMMATION.\*

BY G. U. WENNER, D.D.

Christian missionaries had come to preach the faith among some Saxon tribes. The head men were gathered together in the council hall and angry protests were made against admitting the teachers of the new religion. In the midst of the strife a bird flew into the window and after fluttering for a while thro the torch lit room, escaped on the other side into the darkness of the night. An aged man arose and spoke. To him this earthly life seemed like the fluttering of the bird, out of the unknown into the unknown. If the strangers could bring a message that would tell what became of the souls of men, he asked that they be heard. His words seemed good, the missionaries were received, and the gospel thus found access to the people of Northern England.

The question of the future never lacks interest. "If a man die shall he live again" is asked as earnestly to-day as it was in the days of Job. The varying problems of human thought follow each other in quick succession, but underneath them all remains the constant question of the Prophet Daniel: "Oh! my Lord, what shall be the end of these things."

It is the question of supreme importance to ourselves.

\* Holman Lecture on the Augsburg Confession, Article XVII, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., May 18th, 1904.

"A few more years shall roll  
A few more seasons come ;  
And we shall be with those that rest,  
Asleep within the tomb."

It is the question when we think of those who have gone away from us, "those angel faces which we have loved long since and lost awhile." Oh for an hour's communion with our beloved dead ! For it one would give a thousand years of life on sunlit meadows of this lower world.

It is a practical question for the pastoral office. Clearer views will make funeral sermons more chaste, more helpful, more true. Too often texts are taken from poetry, or philosophy, "dead burying the dead." Even Biblical phrases, wrested from their true place, are made to teach what God has not revealed.

Nor is the question foreign to the every day problems of Christian ethics. The view we hold in regard to the last things determines whether the emphasis is to be placed upon the here or the hereafter.

Christianity is an other-world religion. Men hear us chiefly because they think we can tell them about heaven. When Herbert Spencer persuades them that we know nothing about it, or when our ministry contents itself with making a heaven of this world, they leave us and seek their own heaven.

It is not Christianity alone that has eschatology. All systems of human thought have their doctrine of the end. But there is this difference, philosophy anticipates destruction, Christianity looks forward to redemption. Human thought expects an end, Christianity a consummation. Science investigates the origin of species, Christianity inquires into the destiny of man. For Christianity the end is not death but life, not the night but the day. The conclusion of all human thought on this subject is infinitely pessimistic. In the Christian doctrine we obtain glimpses of a better life, where the final result will be the destruction of sin, the removal of its consequences and the restoration of humanity to a state better than that before the fall.

The life that now is is a process. At its best it is incomplete. Bound by a thousand cords to this world, the soul struggles toward a freedom which here it cannot secure. "Thou, O Lord, hast made us for Thyself, and the heart is unquiet until it finds its rest in Thee." Toward this goal Christianity teaches us to look.

Can we know anything about the future? There is what is called an ethnic basis for the belief which men have in the future. Prior to Christ, and prior to the oldest of our Sacred Scriptures there was a belief in immortality. But while all heathen had some such faith, their systems show no progress in doctrine. Nor have the philosophical systems of to-day gone beyond the faith of Plato on the one hand and the scepticism of Epicurus on the other hand. The nations are still "aliens, strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope." (Ephesians 2 : 12).

Philosophical arguments have always attracted men, and teleological, analogical and moral proofs have served to illustrate many a Christian sermon. They are as convincing as similar proofs of the existence of God which once led a pious hearer to exclaim that she nevertheless believed there was a God.

Spiritualism, clairvoyance and dreams have also been used in investigating the subject, and Gregory drew in part from these sources when he constructed his doctrine of purgatory.

In our day Science is the religion of a multitude of thinkers who respond *agnoscimus* to all suggestions of the future and the unseen. Yet John Fiske, in his essay on "The Unseen World," says: "The human mind, however 'scientific' its training, must often recoil from the conclusion that this is all; and there are moments when one passionately feels that this cannot be all. On warm June mornings in green country lanes, with sweet pine-odours wafted in the breeze which sighs thro the branches, and cloud-shadows flitting over far-off blue mountains, while little birds sing their love-songs, and golden-haired children weave garlands of wild roses; or when in the solemn twilight we listen to wondrous harmonies of Beethoven and

Chopin that stir the heart like voices from an unseen world ; at such times one feels that the profoundest answer which science can give to our questionings is but a superficial answer after all. At these moments, when the world seems fullest of beauty, one feels most strongly that it is but the harbinger of something else,—that the careless play of phenomena is no mere sport of Titans, but an orderly scene with its reason for existing, its

‘ One divine far-off event  
To which the whole creation moves.’ ”

The Church's faith in regard to the last things is thus expressed in the Nicene Creed: "Christ shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead ; whose kingdom shall have no end ;" in the Apostles Creed : " I believe \* \* \* in the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting." These statements express the general faith of the Christian Church ; and in the Augsburg Confession : " Our churches also teach that at the end of the world Christ will appear for judgment ; that he will raise all the dead ; that He will bestow upon the pious and elect eternal life and endless joy, but will condemn wicked men and devils to be punished without end.

" They reject the opinions of the Anabaptists, who maintain that the punishment of devils and condemned men will have an end ; in like manner they condemn those who circulate the Judaizing notions, that before the resurrection of the dead the righteous will possess the government of the world, and the wicked be everywhere suppressed."

This Christian faith is based upon a Divine revelation in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. In great outlines there are here presented to us pictures of the unseen world and of the kingdom of God. It is no wonder if those who examine these pictures with a microscope or interpret their symbolism by the standards of their own narrow lives, find in them many contradictions, and refuse to accept the Scriptures as a source of knowledge. "*Das Auge muss sonnenhaft sein um die Sonne sehen zu koennen.*" Without spiritual insight one cannot see the things of God. Experimental religion, while not a source



of knowledge, is a condition of knowledge, affording a basis for Christian hope and a capacity for understanding the meaning of the Biblical representations.

#### THE HISTORY OF ESCHATOLOGY.

The question of the future has never been absent from the Church's thought and faith. At the present time, it is true, it sometimes seems as if *Novissima* played an unimportant part in her life. Agnosticism scoffs at the doctrine and many Christians place the emphasis on the realization of the kingdom of God in this world. It is one of the signs of the times that there is little preaching about the other world.

The doctrine of the Consummation does not exclude the historical Christ and the development of His kingdom in this world, but its chief theme is the permanent and regenerating influence of the living Christ. The Church will never be satisfied with the fairest products of the kingdom of God on earth. Her prayer is: "Even so come, Lord Jesus."

In some periods the cares or the pleasures of this life choke the word of prophecy. At other times some special feature as the *Parousia*, or the Intermediate State occupies the attention of the Church. And again, as in the age of Rationalism, men's own thoughts of the future take precedence of the Word. But at no time has the Church failed to express her faith.

On the other hand Eschatology has never been the central doctrine of the Church. Theology, Anthropology, Christology and Soteriology have each in turn occupied such a central position. But not so Eschatology. Hence it has never had a complete and independent development or attained a symmetrical dogmatic structure. Each of the *Novissima* has been considered by itself, but no comprehensive view of the whole has ever been attempted. In dogmatic works questions of eschatology are frequently treated along with other subjects as closely related with them.

We may distinguish three periods in Eschatology, the first down to the year 500, the second to the year 1500, and the third to the present time. In the first period Christians main-

tained all the essential features of their hope, not only as against the Jews, who by the rejection of Jesus had become apostates from the Messianic hope, but also against the heathen who were without hope in the world. The death of the body is distinguished from the second death, and the Return, the Resurrection the Judgment and Final Destiny, are everywhere maintained. But there is no doctrinal statement on these points and the views expressed are manifold and often contradictory. For example, there is no agreement as to the place of the departed dead. Nevertheless the substantial truth is maintained not only against the Epicureans but also against such heretics as the Soulsleepers and the like.

The Athanasian Creed was written probably at the beginning of the fifth century. Its closing paragraphs express the faith of the early Church: "He shall come to judge the quick and the dead, at whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies: and shall give account for their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting: and they that have done evil into everlasting fire."

This confession is found even in the baptismal formulas and it became the ecumenic basis for all the churches that followed, no matter how widely they differed on other points.

Indeed it looked at first as if Eschatology would be the central doctrine of the Christian system. The Apostolic Church expected a speedy return of her risen Lord and the conditions in which they lived seemed to indicate an early fulfillment of prophecy. Both Chiliasts and Antichiliasts were represented at this time. The former believed that on this earth Christ would establish a kingdom of glory. Justin Martyr and Tertullian were of that school. The latter believed that there would be a falling away first and that the consummation would only be reached in the other world. Origen and the Alexandrinians belonged to this school.

But the times changed. The Roman Empire itself became subject to the Church, and with the acquisition of world subduing power, Chiasm was forgotten and the whole subject of the next world faded away into abstract ideas of a future life

with no practical importance except as connected with other doctrines. The Church had found her heaven here, and thus was ushered in the second period in the history of Eschatology.

The second period bears the impress of Cyprian. It is the period of the Church. The doctrine "out of Christ no salvation" has changed to *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, because the Church is regarded as the mediator of salvation. The Church is so filled with the sense of her mission that she lays her hands not only on the present but also on the future. The saints and martyrs in the other world are ready to help her in her earthly work, and she is ready to help those who have gone into the other world without a clear title to salvation. Having surrendered the Pauline doctrine of justification, she found new means of saving people by works and satisfactions. Thus there grew up a system of transactions between this world and the next, involving obligations of the living for the dead and of the dead for the living.

The dogmatic basis for this system had been supplied by Augustine who taught that there was one class who certainly were saved, and another class who certainly were not saved. But between these two classes there was a multitude of people nominally Christians but who departed this life in a state of incomplete sanctification. For them there was place neither in heaven nor in hell, and hence there must be an intermediate place. Thro Cæsarius of Arles and Gregory the Great this theory was developed into the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, with its five stages of the Intermediate State. According to this doctrine Christians who die in a state of incomplete sanctification may be cleansed from their venial sins with the help of masses, intercessions and indulgences on the part of the church on earth. In condemnation of this teaching Luther used very strong language.

The Church of Rome contributed but little more to the development of Eschatology than was necessary for the promotion of her business interests. So it seems at least to the historian. Certainly Rome's interpretation of the intermediate state and her doctrine of the intercession of the saints has

brought her a comfortable income, and still helps to replenish her coffers; and these eschatological excrescences were the occasion of the great secession that took place in the days of Martin Luther.

Nevertheless, the great mass of Christians was sustained by the faith of the ecumenical creeds. In that faith they kept the holy Advent season and celebrated the feast of Easter. It was in this period that the *Dies Iste* was sung and Bernard of Cluny lifted up his seraphic voice in praise of Jerusalem the Golden. We cannot but believe that, in spite of clouded doctrine, men often caught the vision of the city which has no need of the sun, for the Lamb is the light thereof, and of which we are told that the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it.

While eschatological questions furnished the occasion for the Reformation, they were not the cause. The question of the Reformation was the way of salvation, not the end. From this standpoint the Reformers revised and supplemented the theology of the Middle Ages. And even as to those points which brought about the Reformation, the questions at issue were subordinate, and the great topics of the Parousia and the Final Destiny were not considered. For this reason the Augustana contents itself with simply repeating the general content of the ecumenical creeds and condemning the Universalist and Millenarian heresies. And in the Apology we read: "The 17th Article our adversaries accept."

But the doctrine of Purgatory, because it is inconsistent with the doctrine of Justification, was repudiated. The soul survived in conscious life and hence there was an intermediate state.\* But death was the end of probation. There could be no prayers or intercessions for the dead, and there was no prospect of conversion in the other world. In these views Lutherans and Reformed substantially agreed.†

Looking at the question from the soteriological point of view,

\* Cf. Kliefoth, *Christliche Eschatologie*, p. 34; Noesgen, *Symbolik*, p. 411.

† Note, however, Apol. Conf., xxiv, § 94, "*quam nos non prohibemus*."

many of the dogmaticans taught that the dying saint entered at once into the perfect joy of heaven, and the impenitent sinner into the condemnation of the lost. This made it difficult to find a place for the last judgment. And it also obscured the teaching of Scripture on the different stages of the heavenly glory.

Later times have developed more independent and more comprehensive views of Eschatology. The pietism of Spener's time was attracted to the subject by the "hope of better times." Bengel and his school came to it thro their study of Scripture. The rise of Rationalism however put a stop to these beginnings, particularly as the pietistic development and chiliastic notions were objectionable to the still powerful orthodoxy.

Rationalism eliminated Parousia, Judgment, Resurrection etc., as Jewish conceptions. The world was going on by natural process toward its golden age. As for the individual, when he died, every one was assured of a philosophical immortality. Sin was only a children's disease incident to our finite condition, and the consequences could not be very serious.

But Rationalism itself gave the impulse to a return to eschatological studies. First, because the people were not content with the meagre basis for the hope of immortality which Rationalism supplied. And again, because the pastors felt that their official duty required them to minister at funerals, a service from which Rationalism had relieved them. But this raised the question what they had to do and how it was to be done, and led to a more careful study of the Bible on the subject of the Intermediate State and of that which followed.

The revival of Bible study has given a special impulse to Eschatology. The earlier Protestant theologians were content to provide for the salvation of the individual. But since Bengel's time the Scriptures have been studied with reference to the questions of the kingdom of God and of the world as a whole, questions which must be considered in interpreting the prophecies of the Parousia and the end of the world.

The close of the nineteenth century ushered in a new era of Church History. Some questions that interested our fathers

still have vital significance. Others have spent their force and awake in us only an interest such as a geologist might have while examining specimens on the shelves of a museum. Only those questions have a permanent value which continue to contribute to the life of the world. Others have had their day and serve merely as mile stones on the highway of history. This great modern world in which we live is thinking its own thoughts and solving its problems, too often without the help of the theologian and the minister. The dogmatical terms and the stereotyped phrases of the past rarely fit exactly into the thinking of a new age. As well might we arm our soldiers with the flint lock muskets of Washington's army, or send against the enemy the wooden ships in which the commodores of 1812 won their immortal victories. We need not object, therefore, to the apothegm of Hoffman of Erlangen: "The old truths in new forms."

The lines at the present time are drawn between what are usually called the liberal and the positive schools of theology. We cannot label the parties exactly, because theologians themselves are on some questions found on one side of the line and on other questions on the other side.

Among the common and distinctive terms of the day is the Kingdom of God. The position involved in this term is ascribed by Ritschl to Schleiermacher and Kant, but in reality it was Bengel who gave it the central importance which it now possesses.

When the question is asked what is it that the revelation of God in Christ brings to man, the answer of both liberals and positives is Everlasting Life, the Kingdom of God. But when we ask for a closer definition of these terms, we find that the liberal theologian emphasizes the present world character that belongs to them. The importance of the divine life in the present experience of the Christian the Positives do not deny. Nor do the Liberals deny the existence of the future state. Kallan, for example, says: "The assurance of an everlasting life in another world and in a kingdom of God beyond this sphere is the very nerve of Christian piety. But on the sim-

ple question whether Eschatology is a necessary factor in Christian thought the Liberal says 'no,' while the Positive says 'yes.'\*\*

Whatever view we may adopt, we must concede that the future life stands in a close relation to this life since it is the harvest for which this present æon furnished the seed. It is the consummation, and with this term we may describe the common viewpoint from which all the various stages of the last things may be considered.

In this paper we shall therefore ask what is Christian teaching in regard to 1, The Consummation of the Individual, and 2, The Consummation of the Church and the World.

#### I. THE CONSUMMATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

The Old Testament is a witness for the future life. Some texts, it is true, point the other way and do not lift us beyond the despairing questionings of the heathen mind. "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preëminence above a beast; for all is vanity." (Eccles. 3, 19.) Others glow with the inspiration of immortality because we interpret them in the light of the later and more transcendent revelation.

The hope of Israel turns in the first instance not to individual redemption, but to the advent of the Messiah. In connection with His coming the expectation grows that the dead will take part in it. (Isaiah 26, 19; Daniel 12, 2: 13.) Israel believed in a living God, and such a faith implied a hereafter. Israel also believed in a living soul and hence man stood in such a relation to the living God that there was no place for the doctrines of Materialism.

Christ certainly so interpreted the Old Testament when in reply to the charge of the Sadducees as to the absurdity of the doctrine of the Resurrection, he proclaimed that the God of

\*Kühel, Ueber den Unterschied, &c., p. 96; Orr, Christian View of God, p. 328; Orr, Ritschlian Theology, p. 179.

Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob was not a God of the dead but a God of the living.

The apocryphal and pseudepigraphic books of Israel have not been sufficiently studied by scholars to afford definite contributions to our subject. But from what we know it appears probable some of the statements of Christ and many of the conceptions of Christ's time can be understood only in the light of the ideas found in the post-canonical literature of the Jews.

It is thro Christ that death has been abolished and life and immortality brought to light through the Gospel. (2 Timothy, 1, 10.) "In my Father's house are many mansions" (John 14, 2), "I am the resurrection and the life," (John 11, 25). Upon these words we rest our faith. The dead whom He raised, and His own resurrection from the dead, these witnesses confirm our faith.

But the Christian conception of immortality is not so much that of a place as of a condition. Death cannot separate the believer from the love of God (Romans 8, 38). He has eaten of the bread which cometh down from heaven and cannot die (John 6, 50). He has kept the saying of Christ and shall never see death (John 8, 51). He that believeth in Christ, tho he were dead yet shall he live (John 11, 25). He has experienced the work of the quickening spirit (1 Cor. 15, 45); of the spirit which giveth life (2 Cor. 3, 6). He has sown to the spirit and in the nature of things he will reap life everlasting (Galatians 3, 8). In fellowship with Christ it is impossible for him to sink into the shadowland of sheol. The soul that in this earthly life found its heaven in material pleasure, separated from the body, of necessity enters the shadows. But the soul whose life is hid with Christ in God, even tho separated from its earthly organ, of necessity enters into the true life. The body is dead but the Spirit is life. (Romans 8, 10). What a light this truth sheds on the question of the effect of sin. Jerry McCauley and John B. Gough never attained in this life what they might have attained if they had not sinned. The consequences of their dissipation followed them to the grave. But not beyond. The spiritual life has a nature of its own and



has attained the qualities of an imperishable existence. Bodily death has only freed it from restraints, and in this respect Plato's vision of the broken prison has been realized. The soul is present with the Lord (2 Cor. 5, 8), and death is gain, (Phil. 1, 23). Whether the immediate place of its existence be Hades or Paradise is not a question of importance, because the soul is not subject to the laws of time and space. The Paradise of which Jesus spoke to the dying thief refers to a condition lost thro sin and restored thro the Consummation. Such is the joy of that state that Paul longed to suffer the pain of death and to sacrifice the joy of further earthly service for Christ that he might enter into that bliss.

"For thee, O dear, dear country, mine eyes their vigils keep;  
For very love, beholding thy happy name, they weep;—  
O one, O only mansion! O Paradise of joy!  
Where tears are ever banished, and bliss hath no alloy."

The state after death is frequently described as a sleep, but this it is only in view of its temporary character which will be changed when the day of resurrection comes, when the soul enters into the possession of its glorified body. Till then it abides in a state of blessed rest, of sacred inwardness, perhaps even of divine growth and progress. More than this has not been revealed, and he who seeks for more or imagines a heaven which God has not revealed, confesses ignorance of that life in Christ which is the only guarantee of a life beyond the grave.

But Christian teaching is not so much interested in the question as to the certainty of life after death, (this is taken for granted in the New Testament and in the creeds of the church), as it is in the significance of death and of the state after death preceding the resurrection.

According to the New Testament, death is "the wages of sin," (Romans 6, 23), "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," (Romans 5, 12). The discovery of a fossil tooth in the Rocky Mountains, which must have gashed the throats of its victims ten thousand years before man was created, makes one think long thoughts on this dogma. Never-

theless we know that sin existed in Satanic spirits before men ate of the forbidden fruit and so we may account for death; and we may easily conceive that if man had remained innocent, the natural process of dissolution would have been a euthanasia instead of an appearance of the king of terrors. And since thro Christ the sting of death has been taken away, the death of the body may be looked upon as a paternal chastisement from which all fear of the wrath of God has been removed.

As to the state after death, the New Testament teaches that life is the period of our probation. In it we are to work out our salvation with fear and trembling. The hour of death decides whether we have done so. Then follows the judgment, for each individual (Heb. 9, 27). Altho it is also true that the believer is not judged, and the unbeliever carries his judgment with him (John 3, 18). Nevertheless in the case of saint or sinner, the result is uncertain while life remains. Life is not only the time to work the works of God, (John 9, 4), but it is the time to make our calling and election sure.

The apostle Peter takes it for granted that certain of the spirits in Hades ought to have the Gospel preached to them. It therefore remains one of the open questions whether an opportunity will be given in the other world for such as have had none here. But the Scripture is silent on this point, and he who remains impenitent with the expectation of obtaining another probation, by that very act removes the condition on which such probation might be considered possible.

For the believer at least no further probation is required. He has entered into life. His sin is forgiven. The bondage of death is overcome. (Heb. 2, 14).\*

Such in brief is the Christian thought of the hereafter. Amid the helplessness of all human speculation there shines in this world of shadows a clear and steady light thro the revelation of

\*The Evangelical Church rejects Metempsychosis and the Reincarnation of later Spiritualists as well as the doctrine of the sleep of the soul, maintained by many Unitarians, the Christadelphians, Cudworth, Whately, Burnet and others, sectarian doctrine condemned by Calvin in 1534 and in another form by Origen in the year 248.

Jesus Christ. And this life is reflected not only in the teachings of the Church, but also in the life and death of countless saints who have been inspired by this hope. The preaching of the resurrection was the keynote of the message of the early church, and the doctrine of the life immortal has been her inspiration in all ages.

In the words of Prof. Salmond: "Because Christianity has found a new basis for the hope of immortality in the fact of Christ's resurrection, and a new centre for it in the personal experience of a new life which is prophetic of its own immortality, there is a certainty in the Christian hope which distinguishes it from every other hope."

Or in the more familiar words of the apostle Peter: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead."

"I believe in the resurrection of the body." "*Mortui omnes resuscitabit*," (Augsburg Confession). The German Christian says "*Auferstehung des Fleisches*," thus following the example of the early Church which boldly employed the terms *sarkos* and *carnis* to express the Christian doctrine in distinction from the Gnostic and heathen conceptions of immortality.

"The resurrection of the body," says Luthardt, "may be argued from Creation. For man was made in the unity of body and soul, and bodily existence is therefore essential to the completeness of our nature.\* Secondly it may be argued from Redemption, for Jesus is the Redeemer of the body as well as the soul, and His bodily resurrection is the pledge of our future condition. Thirdly it may be argued from Sanctification, for the body is the temple of the Holy Ghost and has a destiny therefore not only in time but in eternity."

For Plato and his philosophy the body was a prison, and the soul attained its freedom when it was delivered from the body. The Gnostics therefore denied a material resurrection. Some of the Corinthian Christians said there was no resurrec-

\* In the famous apothegm Oetinger: "Corporeity is the final thought of God."

tion (1 Cor. 15 : 12). The Athenians called Paul a babbler because he spoke of the Resurrection, (Acts 17 : 18). The Sadducees thought they had entangled Christ with their question about the seven brethren, and in the Book of Wisdom (2, 1ff.) we are told of skeptics who declared : " Our life is short and tedious, and in the death of a man there is no remedy : neither was there any man known to have returned from the grave. For we are born at all adventure : and we shall be hereafter as tho we had never been : for the breath in our nostrils is as smoke, and a little spark in the moving of our heart : which being extinguished, our body shall be turned into ashes, and the spirit shall vanish as the soft air."

The Christian Church was therefore called upon not only to warn against individual heretics such as Hymenaeus or Philetus, but also to contend against prevailing philosophies and the skepticism of the world. From time to time her teaching is still denied, as in the positions of Rationalism and of monistic philosophy, but she unfalteringly maintains her early faith " accounting that God is able to raise up, even from the dead " (Heb. 11 : 19). " For why is it judged incredible, if God doth raise the dead ? " (Acts 26 : 8). In the words of our Lord : " Is it not for this cause that ye err, that ye know not the Scriptures, nor the power of God ? " (Mark 12 : 24).

The term resurrection is a figurative expression derived from the idea of the body lowered into the grave, and also from the manner of Christ's own resurrection. The truer conception is brought out in the word *resuscitabit* used in the Augustana, as taken from John 5 : 21, " for as the Father raiseth the dead and quickeneth them, even so the son *quickeneth* whom he will."

Undoubtedly there are problems which we cannot solve, questions which we cannot answer. Will the body of the future be the identical body which we have here ? So the older dogmaticians taught. But how can the atoms which have been dissipated in the universe be collected again ? We must remember however that even in this world the body of every mature person has repeatedly been changed without loss of identity.

And to what extent does the work of redemption apply to the body? Some have maintained that there is a sacramental grace; that even as the body is the organ of the soul in baptism and the eucharist, so thro these sacraments does the body become a partaker of the immortal life. But these are mere suppositions which have no Scripture to support them.

The Old Testament has its hopes of the Resurrection. The passage "I am the God of Abraham," (in the Torah) Jesus interpreted to mean that God was the God of the living. Certainly this included the whole personality, the body as well as the soul. In the Prophetic books there is a growing comprehension of the truth. The passage in Hosea, (6, 1 : 2), refers to a revival of Israel. The passage in Ezekiel refers to a resurrection of national life, yet the figure could not have been used if the prophet had not believed in a personal resurrection. Isaiah undoubtedly teaches a personal resurrection, (26), altho nothing is here said of universal resurrection. The largest hope of the Old Testament, so far as objective doctrine is concerned, is found in Daniel (11 and 12). But even here the promise is confined to Israel and does not embrace humanity. On the other hand the Hagiographic writings in harmony with their spirit express a gradual progress in the subjective experiences of the divine life, a life which surely must extend beyond the confines of death and the grave.

At the time of Christ the resurrection was not only taught by the Pharisees, but it was a matter of popular belief, for Jesus was variously regarded as John the Baptist, Elijah and Jeremiah come to life again. Even Herod entertained this belief. The Sadducees, on the other hand, denied the doctrine of a bodily resurrection, as did the Essenes and those Jews who were influenced by Alexandrian thought. The hopes of the Old Testament and the dim expectations as to the resurrection of the body became a certainty thro the revelation of Christ. When the teachings of Christ are viewed in the light of prevailing ideas, there is nothing in His sayings in regard to the future that does not presuppose or imply a bodily resurrection. God is the "God of the living." "They shall come from the East,

etc." "All that are in their graves shall come forth." The gross conceptions of the Pharisees Christ indeed corrected, but when he said that those who rise from the dead shall be like the angels in heaven, he taught that the new existence will be one in which we shall be clothed upon with a new body. This is in harmony with His teaching in regard to His own resurrection, as when He came down from the Mount of Transfiguration and the disciples questioned among themselves what the rising from the dead should mean. After He had risen from the dead, and had on several occasions appeared to the disciples, they became assured that the body of Christ which they had touched and seen had become a part of His heavenly life.

Thus the resurrection of Christ became the basis of the apostolic teaching.

As in the Old Testament, faith in the living God implied a continued existence in the future life, in the New Testament, the risen Christ gave assurance of a continued life not only of the soul but also of the body. In that life the body of our humiliation shall be fashioned anew and conformed to the body of His glory. (Phil. 3, 21). In Christ's own person this heavenly life already exists in a glorified corporeity and our life is hid with Christ in God (Col. 3, 3). That is, the ideal Christian life, altho in point of fact we are very far from it now. "But when Christ who is our life shall be manifested, then shall we also with Him be manifested in glory."

The apostolic doctrine of the Resurrection rests however not only on the objective fact of Christ's resurrection, it has also another basis in the Christian's personal experience of the risen Christ. "If the spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through His Spirit that dwelleth in you." (Romans 8, 11).

Thus the New Testament, both in the teachings of Christ and the apostles, transports us to a Beulah land from which we may behold almost with undimmed vision the life of the redeemed. Do you sometimes question whether you will ever meet your loved ones there?

"Oh, faithless heart, the same loved face, transfigured,  
 Shall meet thee there,  
 Less sad, less wistful, in immortal beauty  
 Divinely fair!  
 The mortal veil, washed pure with many weepings,  
 Is rent away,  
 And the great soul that sat within its prison  
 Hath found the day."

"In the clear morning of that other country,  
 In Paradise,  
 With the same face that we have loved and cherished  
 She shall arise!  
 Let us be patient, we who mourn, with weeping,  
 Some vanished face,  
 The Lord has taken but to add more beauty  
 And a diviner grace."

## II. THE CONSUMMATION OF THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD.

Teaching on this subject is derived from the prophetic words of Scripture. These prophecies have been variously interpreted throughout the Christian centuries, and for an ordinary disciple it is not an easy task to find his way thro the mazes of Chiliasm and Antichiliasm, of Premillenarianism and Postmillenarianism; and many are utterly discouraged when they are called upon to give the number of the beast or to solve the problems of the times, times and half.

In our ignorance we may derive some consolation from the assurance of Peter that "no prophecy is of private interpretation," (2 Peter 1 : 20), and that on questions where the Son of Man himself withheld information it is not incumbent upon us to be absolutely certain in our dogmatic utterances.

The Augustana said but little on this subject, contenting itself with a simple confession of faith in the Return, the Judgment and the Final Destiny, and condemning the position of the Universalists and the Anabaptists.

### CHRIST'S RETURN.

It is called the *Parousia*, (Matt. 24, 3), the *Epiphaneia*, (2 Thess. 2, 8), the Day of the Son of Man, (Luke 17, 24), the

Advent, in the Athanasian Creed, and the *Reditus Christi ad Judicium* in the Augsburg Confession.

The time of His coming is known only to the Father. When it takes place it will not be as with His first advent, apprehended by faith only, but it will be made evident to the whole world because it will be in fact the final decision on the fate of the world.\* Certain portents however precede. One is the universal proclamation of the Gospel. Whether the conversion of Israel is another is an open question among Lutheran dogmaticians. Luther and the older teachers said no. Flaccius, Calixtus and others said yes. St. Paul himself was greatly puzzled over the fact that Israel seemed to have been overlooked. At the present time the conviction prevails that in the last times before the Parousia, the Jews as a people will be brought into the fold of Christ.

Another forerunner of the Parousia is Antichrist, a subject that interests us as Lutherans partly because our contemporaries, the Missourians, maintain that the Pope is Antichrist, a position that was held in modified forms by the older theologians, while modern Lutheran scholars no longer defend it.

The statement of St. John, "Even now are many antichrists," teaches the presence of an antichristian spirit in the midst of the visible Church. This spirit may become embodied in some individual or institution, and the Church therefore was right when it spoke of Nero or Mohammed or the Papacy as Antichrist. And as in the unconverted individual there is a growing hostility to the demands of conscience and religion, so there is an antichristian *Weltanschauung* with a constantly increasing opposition until the time of the great falling away.

For it is a mistake to believe that the consummation will be brought about in the way of an immanent development of the work which Christ began. The parable of the seed, (Matt. 12 : 31), seems to teach this, but it only describes the nature of the kingdom, and nowhere are we told that this is really accomplished. It is certain that Christ did not teach the final

\* Weiss, Religion des Neuen Testaments, p. 307.



victory of His kingdom in the sense in which we so often hear it proclaimed. On the other hand He spoke of a little flock, and the more the ideas of His kingdom are realized, the more do they call forth a reaction and an opposition of the antichristian world. Apostolic teaching conveys the same truth, and in the Apocalypse the believers are warned in regard to the great tribulation, (Rev. 7 : 14).

At the coming of Christ, Antichrist will be overcome. The personal return of Christ in the body is everywhere taught in the New Testament. The hope and expectation of this return stood in the forefront of the faith of the early Church. Indeed the Parousia is regarded by Dörner as one of the oldest dogmas. Christ Himself foretold it from the time He foretold His Passion (Mark 8 : 38). He would not be the Messiah if he did not bring about the Consummation. This coming was foretold by the prophets (Joel 2, Malachi 3, Daniel 7 : 13). The triumph was temporarily interrupted on earth. It was destined to be completed by Christ in the state of His exaltation. The concourse of angels indicated the divine glory in which it would be accomplished.

The detailed features of the First Advent were not described in the Old Testament. So too the detailed features of the Second Advent are nowhere clearly stated in the New Testament. The pictorial language in which Christ's Second Advent and the judgment are described have therefore given rise to various interpretations.

Among liberal interpreters Beyschlag says: "In the symbol of His coming again on the clouds of heaven Jesus grasps up together all that which lay beyond his death—the whole glorious reversal of His earthly life and His death on the cross, from His resurrection on till the perfecting of His Kingdom at the last day." On this Professor Orr remarks: "A careful study of the passages will compel us to agree with Beyschlag on one main point, namely that Jesus does not always speak of His coming in the same sense; that it is to Him rather a process in which many elements flow together in a single image, than a single definite event, always looked at in the same light.

Thus, He says to the High Priest, with obvious reference to the prophecy in Daniel, 'Henceforth,' (*von nun an*) 'Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.' He came again to His disciples after the resurrection; He came in the mission of the Comforter; He came in the power and spread of His kingdom, especially after the removal of the limitations created by the existing Jewish polity, which seems to be the meaning in the passage, 'There be some of them that stand here which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom;' He has come in every great day of the Lord in the history of His Church; He will come yet more conspicuously in the events of the future." Weiss maintains that Jesus and the writers of the New Testament expected that the Parousia would occur in that generation. It was this expectation that made the Apostolic Church so watchful and confirmed it in the Christian life.

Some of the difficulties of interpretation are removed when we remember that Christ spoke of His coming in a threefold sense. He promises that He will always be with them, He will dwell with them. In a spiritual sense His coming is continuous and invisible. Again He speaks of the manifestation of His kingdom in power which will take place from henceforth, (Matt. 26 : 64). And finally He speaks of the coming in power and great glory. This last Parousia which may be called the eschatological in distinction from the ideal and historical comings, will take place at a certain time, "on that day," "the day of the Son of Man" (Luke 17 : 31).

The destruction of Jerusalem is connected with this subject, but the limits of our paper will not permit us to consider it.

Does the Parousia involve a millennium? The early Church believed on the authority of Revelation (20) that there would follow a reign of peace for a thousand years. This faith had some connection with early Jewish expectations in regard to the coming of the Messiah and also with prevalent Jewish beliefs as found in the apocryphal writings. But there is nothing in the words of Christ or in the teachings of the apostles to

warrant it. They know of no other coming than that of the Parousia and the Judgment. (Matt. 25, 31; 2 Peter 3, 10). Christ speaks of but one resurrection. The passages that are quoted to prove a first resurrection do not necessarily teach what the Chiliasts force them to teach (Luke 14, 14; I Cor 15, 23; I Thess. 4, 16).

The Millennarian faith of the early Church was opposed by the Alexandrinians and finally by Augustine. Neither Greek nor Roman Catholics accept the doctrine. The Church found its millennium in the universal sway which she enjoyed. Among the sects of the Middle Ages and the Reformation the doctrine again came into prominence. In the crass form in which it was held by the Anabaptists it was condemned by the Augustana. The orthodox teachers of the 17th century and leading dogmaticians of the present day repudiate Chiliasm.\*

The whole subject is still an unsolved hieroglyphic. A complete rejection of Chiliasm ignores prophetic passages and stifles the longing of many a Christian heart.

Thus Bonar sings:—

Come, Lord, and tarry not!  
Bring the long-looked for day;  
Oh, why these years of waiting here,  
These ages of delay?

Come, for thy saints still wait;  
Daily ascends their sigh;  
The Spirit and the Bride say, Come!  
Dost thou not hear the cry?

Come, for creation groans,  
Impatient of thy stay,  
Worn out with these long years of ill,  
These ages of delay.

\*There is a *Chiliasmus Subtilissimus* of Spener, Rothe, Loehe, Vilmar, Auberlen, Beck, Frank and Dorner and a *Chiliasmus Subtilior* of Petersen, Bengel and Oetinger. The last named agree with the Premillennarians in placing the coming of the Lord before the millennium, while the Spener school agree with the Postmillennarians in placing it after the millennium.

Come, and make all things new,  
Build up this ruined earth,  
Restore our faded Paradise—  
Creation's second birth.

Come, and begin thy reign  
Of everlasting peace;  
Come, take the kingdom to thyself,  
Great King of Righteousness!

What is true in Chiliasm? This is the answer, in a free rendering which Weiss gives in his *Religion des Neuen Testaments*: "The establishment of the kingdom of God means the regeneration of the world, in all its manifestations and life. The centre and soul of this life is religion. The establishment of the kingdom failed as to Israel not because of inherent weakness but because of the sin of those who rejected it. Hence the prophecy could not be fulfilled. A New Testament ideal was then established. But neither will that ideal be reached or that kingdom established, nor can it be. Still both New and Old Testament prophecies point to the same end, and Revelation 20 is not a fantastic dream. The Church of Christ is the true Israel. The Church is to pray and to work for the coming of the kingdom even tho she knows that the conditions of its coming, its acceptance on the part of the world will not be fulfilled, and that the prophecy in regard to the kingdom can therefore not be fulfilled in this world. To what extent the Church will realize this kingdom depends upon the degree in which she herself demonstrates in her own life the spirit of Christ.

The absence of any clear teaching on this subject from Christ and the apostles makes it impossible to lay an absolutely secure foundation for this doctrine. On the other hand, it would be a distinct loss if we had to expunge from our books of worship such a hymn as:—

Hail to the Lord's Anointed,  
Great David's greater Son;  
Hail in the time appointed,  
His reign on earth begun.

But it must suffice us to believe that there will yet come on earth a period of great prosperity for the Church when she may manifest to all the world the blessings of Messiah's kingdom. Nevertheless on earth her mission must continue to be to watch and fight and pray. Her millennium will come in the kingdom of glory.

"History," says Luthardt, "is the unfolding of possibilities. When the possibilities of the history of this world have been exhausted, then will come the end." Our Saviour teaches this truth in the parable of the tares. The harvest is the end of the world. Then will be delivered a definite judgment which will separate the good from the evil.

In one sense, it is true, judgment takes place now and continually. *Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht*. Or, in the words of Christ, "now is the judgment of this world." But the Scriptures clearly teach a final verdict, to be given at the close of the present æon. On no other subject did Jesus speak so fully and so frequently.

The New Testament teaching on the subject of the Judgment is a fulfillment of the doctrine of the Old Testament. There is, however, this characteristic difference. The Old Testament at first referred rather to the judgment of nations than of individuals. Not until later times do we read of the judgment of individuals, and even then it was confined to Israel. The non-canonical writings deal very largely with this subject, and Jesus undoubtedly spoke of the judgment in terms and figures that were current in His day. But His teaching freed the subject from the limited and fantastic notions that prevailed and gave to it a spiritual and universal character which it never had before. A new thought in His teaching is the fact that He Himself will be the Judge. The standard by which men will be judged is their conduct. For conduct is the expression of character. Then shall be made manifest whether the life of men has been upward or downward, toward God or toward the world.

It has been claimed that John's Gospel teaches a different kind of judgment from that which is portrayed in the Synop-

tics. According to St. John, Christ said: "God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world should be saved through Him. He that believeth on Him is not judged; he that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God." "And if any man hear My sayings, and keep them not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth Me, and receiveth not My sayings, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I spake, the same shall judge him at the last day." But it is only a different way of looking at the same truth.

The awful significance of that day is not dependent upon the pictures of the event that have come down to us from the painters and the poets of the Middle Ages. Granted that even the Scriptural account is to a great extent clothed in imagery and symbolism, the essential truth remains that there is an infinite import in character and the day is coming when men will appear to be what they really are.

Day of anger! that dread day shall the sign in heaven display, and the earth in ashes lay!

Oh, what trembling shall appear, when His coming shall be near, who shall all things strictly clear!

What shall I before Him say? How shall I be safe that day—when the righteous scarcely may?

King of awful majesty, saving sinners graciously—Fount of Mercy! save Thou me!

Leave me not, my Saviour! one for whose soul Thy course was run! lest I be that day undone!

Though unworthy is my prayer, make my soul Thy mercy's care, and from death eternal spare!

When Thy voice in wrath shall say, cursed one, depart away! call me with Thy blest, I pray.

#### FINAL DESTINY.

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."

"Our churches also teach \* \* that He will bestow upon the pious and elect eternal life and endless joys, but will condemn wicked men and devils to be punished without end \* \* They rejected the opinions \* \* \* that the punishment of devils and condemned men will have an end."

This is the doctrine which the Church of all ages has derived from the teachings of Christ, and of Scripture. In the early Church Origen, and in modern times Schleirmacher have argued in favor of the final salvation of all men. While the sect of Universalists is not very large, the doctrine which they maintain is prevalent in many churches formerly regarded as orthodox, and it is noted that one rarely hears sermons on the doctrine of eternal punishment even in the churches that retain it in their symbols and catechisms. It is evidence of

"The wish that of the living whole  
No life may fail beyond the grave."

The Scriptural argument turns on the meaning of the words Gehenna and Aionios. It is sufficient for us to know that nowhere does Christ teach the ultimate salvation of the wicked, but in many places He does teach the doctrine of their final perdition. Even where Apokatastasis is referred to, the destruction of the wicked is taught at the same time.

There is another doctrine however, the opposite of universalism, which under the guidance of such minds as Rothe and Bushnell has found favor in modern thought; it is the doctrine of annihilation or conditional immortality. It proceeds upon the idea that man is not necessarily or essentially immortal, and in view of the destructive nature of sin it believes that in the course of æons possibly, the wicked will be destroyed. There are Scripture passages also which seem to be in harmony with this view. It certainly is a more comfortable view than that of eternal punishment. But a sober interpretation of the teachings of Christ will not admit of this doctrine.

There is also a doctrine of future probation for such as have not had an opportunity of accepting or rejecting Christ. It is held by Dorner, Godet, Martensen, Van Oosterzee and others.

The passage in First Peter in regard to the preaching to the spirits in prison is held to support this view.

But there is not enough in Scripture to entitle this view to the place of a dogma. It is rather a hope, or a question, the solution of which we may well leave with Him who is the judge of all the earth and who surely will do that which is right. For our practical preaching it is our duty to proclaim that now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation. And as for the state of impenitent men, it must be remembered that salvation consists in things which they do not desire, and to force upon them this salvation in spite of their own deliberate choice would be to condemn them to perdition. "The mind is its own place and in itself can make a hell of heaven, a heaven of hell." The state of the lost is to have no part in the blessedness of the righteous and to abide in death.

"But the righteous into life eternal." "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him."

"O sweet and blessed country,  
The home of God's elect!  
O sweet and blessed country,  
That eager hearts expect!  
Jesus in mercy bring us  
To that dear land of rest!  
Who art, with God the Father,  
And Spirit, ever blest." Amen.



## ARTICLE II.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ALONE: OUR BULWARK AGAINST  
ROME.

BY PROFESSOR L. IHMELS, D.D.

The occasion of this essay is two fold. It is called forth not only by a practical but also by a scientific necessity, as over against Denifle's work on Luther. This work brings us to the painful consciousness that we must again address ourselves to a polemic against Rome, and it also shows the kind of polemic still used by Rome. The incredible slandering of Luther, and the complete inability to understand the motives that impelled Luther and Lutheranism, make it difficult to take Denifle's work in earnest; but the scientific importance of the author in his own Church, and the reception accorded the book in the Catholic Church, are such as not to allow us to pass it over in silence. We do not feel called upon to enter into particulars; but as evangelical Christians, we must turn attention afresh to the foundations of our faith, and to the general conception which it presents to us. In this sense our theme stands in connection with the article of "the standing or falling Church."

We do not intend to present Luther's doctrine of Justification as a whole, in which there are many problems that still need a new treatment; much rather is it our purpose, on the good foundation anew to seek certainty for the confession of Justification, and to bring to light its impelling fundamental principles, and that under the two-fold point of view presented by the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, viz., the maintenance of a steadfast consolation for alarmed consciences, and the preservation of the honor of the Lord. The first may be designated as the practical interest which the Lutheran Church has in this question, in that she is convinced that only this confession of justification by faith can satisfy the deepest longing of the human heart. But the second establishes the right of our contention against Rome, since only through this confession will the honor due to Christ the Lord be accorded him.

These are the two points which Denifle should have more vigorously seized upon and undermined, if he had meant to tear Luther out of our hearts, for in these two questions alone are we interested. In everything else we can and are willing to learn. But Denifle did not do that. He has followed Luther's inner development; and this we hail with the greater delight, because in that way Denifle expressly recognizes the fact that Luther's Reformation did not proceed from an arbitrary search for something new, but that it can be understood only from the personal development of the Reformer. But according to Denifle, how did Luther's development proceed? Very simply: Everything that has been hitherto taught on the subject is wrong. Biographers have believed Luther's lies and all that he had to say about his cloister-life and his struggles to obtain comfort in that way. If as investigators they had pursued a scientific method they would soon have reached the light.

In reality, according to Denifle, there are two errors, which were decisive for Luther's development, the one theoretical and the other practical in character. The latter belongs to the year 1515.

According to Denifle Luther still taught correctly on *concupiscentia* in 1514, namely, that it is not sin and guilt, but a remnant of original sin, which still lingers as a punishment, but which can be and must be overcome. On the contrary in 1515 it is for him unconquerable, and good works are altogether impossible. This change has its causal root in Luther's personality; the doleful internal nature of Luther is the key to the entire reformation. He felt his passions, pride, violence, sensuality; with these he fought in vain, and was always only worsted in the conflict. From this he drew the conclusion that concupiscence is absolutely insuperable; but not in the sense that it ever and anon returns, for then he would have remained a good Catholic; but in the sense that concupiscence absolutely cannot be eradicated; the conflict against sin is absolutely vain. Now it was that he looked on *concupiscentia* no longer as a remnant of original sin, but as sin itself. As a con-

sequence he engaged less earnestly in the conflict, and surrendered himself more and more to his passions. Hence for him the concupiscence of human nature became the equivalent of original sin, and the Church's doctrine of the abiding *concupiscentia* he turned over to the abiding of original sin. Hence he came to the conviction that grace continues in connection with or despite sin (the imputed righteousness). Of the sanctifying grace which eradicates sin, and imparts a real sanctification, he henceforth knew nothing, but he knew only a justification which only covered sin externally, but did not really change the person.

But this view did not spring exclusively from Luther. Much more does Luther, despite his bluster against Occam, show himself wholly a disciple of Occam. It was the doctrine of the Occamists that a person is justified only through the free divine acceptation. This doctrine Luther received, though not in the sense of Occam, but in a one-sided further development. For the Occamists did not have to reckon with the doleful inner nature of Luther, which led him, in addition, to teach: We are justified only *de nominatione aliena*, that is, by imputation.

With Luther everything now follows logically.

Denifle excuses this practical aberration of Luther by pointing to the other, the theoretical error. Luther was out-and-out only a half educated theologian, who had no comprehension of a sounder scholasticism. Only of Nominalism at most did he have a little knowledge. And yet the prayers which he had to pray daily ought to have shown him that the Church occupied a very different relation to divine grace, yea, that she ever and only glorified the grace and mercy of God as a source of salvation. But despairing of his own righteousness, this ignorant hothead tried by his own natural power to become righteous. Hence he must inevitably suffer shipwreck. He knew nothing of real sanctifying grace. Therefore he did not understand the doctrine of the Church. He did not pray for grace, as he prayed very little in general, and hence he could not reach the goal. If, then, he sought to accomplish by monastic works, by excessive mortification, by his own performances, (presuppose

ing that all this is true) what he was not willing to obtain by prayer, the Church is not to blame for this, for she has always declared that a person should do too little rather than too much mortifying.

Denifle comes again and again to speak of Luther's doleful inner nature, his wilfulness; and it is not to be denied that from this gloomy starting-point his presentation of Luther's gloomier development is as consistent as it is simple. But can Denifle really regard it as possible that a historical phenomenon such as the Reformation can be explained in such a manner? He seems to so conceive, and he inquires for the causes, as to how it came to pass that in so short a time, Luther gained such a foot-hold in Germany and in all countries. He does not hesitate to recognize Luther's judgments on the degeneration of Monasticism and on the monstrous moral corruption of his time. He employs all this for his own purpose, for that enables him to make intelligible the origin and rapid spread of the Reformation movement, and to characterize Luther's followers. Incendiaries, vagabonds, men morally depraved, bodily and mentally ruined—these are the people of the Reformation, riffraff, like Luther himself.

This is enough. It is plain now, how small is the outlook we have for an understanding with Luther. But must we not suppose that every Catholic must now be startled if he sees Luther go into a cloister? What, then, drove Luther to this step? On many things we can dispute and treat with a Romanist, but it is a fact that obtrudes itself on every honorable man, that the motive, and consequently the beginning of Luther's development, was really nothing else than the longing for indubitable certainty in regard to a gracious God. Even a Denifle will have to concede that Luther passed from hopeful study to the poverty of the cloister. How is it to be explained if he were not impelled by the longing to become pious? We can assure Denifle that what draws us so powerfully to Luther is the fact that in him we meet an unsubduable longing for holiness that is to be realized and to have an answer at any cost.

How can I find a gracious God? This inquiry of Luther is the true starting point of the Reformation. This general inquiry includes in itself two inquiries: How does God become gracious to me? and how do I become certain that God is gracious to me? It is of decided significance for the Reformation viewed as a whole to represent to itself that for Luther the two inquiries run together, but the dominant one, the impelling motive is exactly this: How do I become certain of God as my gracious God? This, the decisive inquiry, means really that Luther did not primarily seek after a new theory of justification, but what he sought, and finally found, though not in the way shown him by the Church, was the practical personal certification of God's grace. It is now indispensable and even *a priori* to be expected that this new kind of personal certification must express itself in a new theoretical conception of justification, and it is also to us of higher significance for the theory, that exactly in Luther's practical seeking and finding do the impelling thoughts become so completely transparent. In reality the Romish Church does not wish to give—it cannot give—an answer to the inquiry for the personal certainty of salvation.

It does not wish to. Denifle blames Luther severely for calling it "a pestilential doctrine" of the Romish Church that a person must doubt in regard to the certainty of salvation. Luther did not distinguish between "not knowing certainly" and "doubting" (*non certum scire* and *dubitare*). We can only inquire: How much is a person, who is longing for God and for salvation, benefitted by this distinction? and of what use is the explanation of the Council of Trent that no one can know with a certainty of faith that excludes all mistake, that he has attained grace? much rather that every pious man, though he dare not doubt in reference to the mercy of God, the merit of Christ, and the virtue of the sacraments, yet when he looks at himself and his own weakness, must tremble and fear in regard to his state of grace.

The evangelical theology does not need first to have it said by Denifle that the Catholic Church at the same time that she rejects the certainty of salvation, is wont to invite to confidence

in God. This is very evident in so far as confidence has to do with the objective promise of salvation. But here we have to do with the personal certainty of salvation, with the inquiry: Can I be certain of the grace of my God? And here, also, according to Denifle, the proposition of Thomas Aquinas is valid, namely, that a person cannot know in the form of certainty, but only by conjecture (*non certitudinaliter, sed conjecturaliter*) that he is in grace. He can conclude this from various signs. Thomas names three such signs: If he has delight in God; if he feels contempt for worldly things; if he is certain that he does not live in deadly sin. Oswald also has lately given this practical consolation in order thereby to alleviate somewhat that theoretical resignation to certainty of salvation. Certainly no person can be sure of his salvation; and yet this must not be understood "as though the courageous man who is conscious of his honest effort, has to surrender himself to painful disquiet and heart-consuming doubt."

We have only to inquire whether this two-fold view can really be accepted, whether it is not psychologically impossible for a person at the same time to be in a state of fear and in a state of confident hope.

Meanwhile the position of the Romish Church towards the certainty of salvation can be understood only when we consider that she not only does not wish to give, but also *can not* give certainty. For she understands Justification to mean that sanctifying grace is inserted in man, and that it both eradicates sin and also brings about purification from sin. In this way the person enters into a state of grace and becomes an heir of eternal life. As a matter of fact, this effect occurs only in the case of children who die immediately after baptism. Where the Church can lay claim to the self-activity of man, she does so. For the adult the entrance into the state of grace means that he has merited his salvation. If the Catholic Christian wishes to be certain of his state of grace, he must show both, that the sanctifying grace has been infused into him, and also that he correspondingly engages in good works. Naturally the emphasis falls on the latter. At any rate, according to the

Romish Church, the reception of grace presupposes an inner preparation for grace, and the certainty of salvation will first strive to know whether an inner preparation exists, because it is at the same time assumed that the proper preparation necessarily has the reception of grace as its consequence. But this means nothing else than that the preparation for grace grants a lawful claim for the attainment of it. And yet this the Church expressly rejects. Grace is not to be merited. So, even the Council of Trent declares in unambiguous language; the result is, that a certainty of grace is absolutely impossible, yea, inadmissible for man.

If now a certainty of salvation is not obtained from reflection on the disposition to receive grace, then is the person all the more inclined himself to establish a state of grace from individual criteria of the same. The evil here is that according to experience every temptation and sin makes it again the more uncertain for the sincere person, whether he has indeed ever received grace, and then to him who longs for certainty nothing remains, except that he, as Oswald says, of himself makes "the honorable effort of the brave man" to conclude from this very external holiness and righteousness that the internal change in him has really taken place. But how even this effort to comfort one's self may go, we may learn by feeling the pulse in order to determine by external signs, how we have progressed internally—an effort on the part of the Christian living under the influence of grace, as inconsequent as it is hopeless.

How wholly different with Luther! This is the astonishing thing in Luther's experience, that after he has struggled with all the means of the Church and by the power of divine grace to become righteous of himself, and ever and anon failed, he learned by experience that even under the influence of grace a person cannot of himself attain to that righteousness which avails before God. In this experience there is a different estimate of sin, especially of the meaning of original sin and evil lust. In the Romish Church (and entirely so to Denifle) Luther's deep sense of sin remains to this day incomprehensible. She sees in original sin only a defect, and not an injury of the

nature of man; and in concupiscence not an imputable sin, but a welcome means for ascending to virtue by overcoming it. But the Augustana, when it describes original sin, names this as its dreadful corruption, first, that man as he is now born, is without the fear of God, and without confidence towards God, and then adds "and with concupiscence." That is, sin is first to be estimated religiously. Man's entire tendency has become ungodly, so that now also everything that proceeds from this ungodly source cannot stand before God's absolute standard, yea, all his works, and even the nature of the man who is proved by faith and good works, is nothing, and nothing remains to him except only to fly to the grace of God as the beginning and the end of the way of salvation. But then in reality it is more than a misunderstanding of Luther when Denifle represents him as having declared that all the divine influence over against this perverse tendency as useless. For does not Denifle know that according to Luther justifying faith produces a new creature in man, and that Luther posits faith also as an ethical principle, and includes in it the same thing that the Romish Church calls love? But all this Denifle calls a contradiction, an inconsistency of the half educated theologian.

From all this we perceive that to the Romish Church our evangelical idea of faith is strange, yea, incomprehensible. To her faith is indeed a conviction in regard to divine truth, but only such, as it were also the first step in the preparation for the reception of sanctifying grace. She requires that faith "gain form through love," in order that God may then really be able to infuse his grace; but she does not show how this can be effected. How can I love God before whom I must stand in awe? This is what Luther regarded as impossible, namely, to make love even the basis of knowledge, to say nothing about the real ground of justification, since only through justification does man become capable of loving God. And Luther never doubted that the source of love to God is included exactly in certainty in regard to the gracious God. Not whether the indwelling desire is invincible; even not whether



in individuals it can and must be overcome ; even not whether in justification a complete renewing of the person takes place ; but the point of the question on which the matter turns, is whether all this which God has wrought in the Christian, as it exists through faith, can be the real ground of Justification and of the certainty of our standing in grace. And this we deny with all emphasis, because in our very heart there still remain struggles that stain the love and the service of God.

A thing that the Romish Church ought to understand and comprehend is that the evangelical ethics will bear comparison with that of Rome. Denifle ought to have asked himself whether the Romish ethics has the courage to emphasize, as Luther does so profoundly, earnestly and simply in the Small Catechism, that only that act has merit before God which is shaped by the motive of love. Why, then, did the Bull *Unigenitus* condemn Jansen's proposition, "that only that has merit which proceeds from love"? Yet even Thomas concedes that love is perfected only in the world to come. Even Denifle knows that in the final hour nothing but the sin-forgiving mercy of God must enter as the means of making us acceptable to God, and that even the Romish Church finally points the dying only to Christ, his merit, his blood, his death. Can it then be so perverse that the Lutheran Church gives to this thought also in theory the central place?

But where, now, is it conceded that we with all our striving, even under divine grace, do not attain to the righteousness that avails before God, and even to this day we are under the accusing declaration of the apostle: He who keeps the whole law and sins in one thing, to him it is sin,—since it is clear that we must renounce all our own righteousness, and only then dare we hope for salvation, when over against this painful confession of deficiency in our own glory we hold the triumph of that righteousness which is revealed by God in Jesus Christ, and is reckoned to faith. But if this righteousness is conditioned in the work of Jesus Christ, if it is imparted to us only by a divine offer, then on our side it can be only faith that responds to and accepts this offer of God. Faith may also be an

ethical and mystic principle, yet it can serve the act of justification only in so far as it responds affirmatively to the divine offer.

But Denifle does not understand this. He scoffs at it. He speaks of a Spanish wall, which faith, according to Luther, erects between sin and God, of a game of ball, in which man tosses his sin to Christ, and Christ tosses his righteousness to man. He speaks of "Luther's comfortable faith." Yea, Denifle has succeeded in writing as follows: "The real sinner will laugh in his fist when through his comfortable trust as through a glass in a raree show he beholds Christ, and now once for all sees hanging on him all those sins with which, as with his old cronies, he has hitherto stood on the most friendly footing." Does not Denifle know that here he is against Paul, and against the entire Holy Scripture? Or does he think that all this can be proved by reference to the passage in Gal. 5:6: "Faith which worketh by love"? This passage does not in any sense confound us. For we know no faith which does not actually include in itself the principle of love. Where ceremonialism and external legalism, and similar externals, such as Paul had to fight, make their appearance, there we also say that only that faith avails which works by love; and where a person would rest merely on his orthodoxy there we still say with James, that such faith is worthless, is dead. The question is not whether faith is necessary, and is an ethical principle, but whether as an ethical principle it justifies before God. And here Denifle might learn that faith has value only in so far as it lays hold of the great deeds of Christ.

We can assure Denifle that his propositions as we have just now heard them would be most painful to us in the mouth of a Christian theologian; but they are most welcome in the mouth of an adversary. So long as such adversaries wish to misrepresent us, we have nothing to fear. If Paul says, 2 Cor. 5, that Christ was made sin for us that we might be made righteous in him, will not Denifle then at least anticipate that the matter finally has reference to the estimate to be placed in the person of Christ, yea, to the understanding of Christianity as a whole?

The antithesis between Rome and ourselves does not consist in what individual writers have said, but in this, namely, that Rome does not give the proper place to the person of Christ and to the grace of God. Denifle does say, indeed, that Justification is an act of God's grace, and it is the official teaching of the Romish Church that grace cannot be merited, but it is immediately added that man has to prepare himself for the reception of grace, and that then it is *right* for God to infuse grace and the Holy Spirit into the person so disposed. In this appeal to the equity of God we perceive that the Romish Church treats justification as an ordinance of law, and that for her there exists no direct place for the person and work of Christ in the act of justification. Justification is grace, indeed, but by the power of grace man must earn salvation for himself, that is, it is an ordinance of grace which is made possible by living in the ordinance of law.

In this way the person of Christ is driven into the background. If Christ is a mediator in the general sense, then must he be such also in the act of justification. According to the Romish doctrine the merit of Christ is only the presupposition for the working of man, and in justification Christ comes into consideration psychologically only in so far as he has given to God the possibility of infusing grace into the person who has disposed himself, by virtue of which (grace) the person then creates salvation for himself. Thus, in reality, salvation rests half upon grace and half upon man's own working, and the work of Christ is made void.

In other words: The Romish doctrine presents not only a torso of Christianity, but it also takes from God the honor that is due him. But how much this stands in contradiction to the Holy Scriptures is strikingly shown by the incident reported by Paul in Gal. 2. In Antioch Peter had at first unhesitatingly eaten with the Heathen Christians, and by so doing had acknowledged that he was justified only through faith in Christ. But afterwards he turned away from the Heathen Christians and preferred the Jewish Christians who were still in bondage to the Levitical traditions. Paul rebuked him for this as for a

piece of hypocrisy, because in this way he returned to the works of the Law, and by his conduct declared that a person is saved not alone through Christ; but that Christ's work needs to be completed by an act of man. To such an extent is the work of Christ in Paul's estimation the sole cause of salvation that the effort to perfect it in any sense by one's own act, at once undermines and destroys his whole conception of salvation. Our fellowship with God rests so exclusively on God's initiative, that for man the only question is whether through this initiative of God he will allow himself to gain access to it by faith.

But finally the difference between us and Rome consists in a different understanding of Christianity in general. When the question came before Luther: How shall I be certain that God is gracious to me, there lay in that question already a conception of Christianity which in the deepest sense is strange to the Romish Church. Therefore, with all apparent similarity, it is nearly impossible for the Romish and the Lutheran doctrine of Justification to be at all reconciled with each other. The interest in this matter on the two sides is entirely different. Ritschl's formula is not tenable, namely, that the Romish doctrine of justification directs its answer to the question, How can I attain to a state to do good works? while Luther asks: How can I obtain a gracious God? The antithesis is more correctly understood by saying that for the Romish Christian salvation is a future blessing that belongs to the eternal world, and is to be expected in the form of a reward; but for the Lutheran Christian it consists in the personal fellowship with God that is already present; that there the state of grace is a real condition in man, a habit; here it is a relation of man to God.

Now we understand the difference between the Romish and the Lutheran doctrine on all sides. It is now clear why it is that Rome can so easily rest satisfied with the uncertainty of the state of grace. The Church is the impersonal surety of the future salvation, the institute of salvation for all her faithful members, but only in so far as they unite themselves with the Church. How the individual, separated from the Church, can

strive after fellowship with God remains incomprehensible to Rome. On the contrary, for us the Church is the congregation of believers, which in word and sacrament represents and communicates the historical revelation of God in Christ.

What we have presented are only hints, and yet a reminder, that everything that distinguishes us from Rome must stand somehow in connection with the article of Justification. Hence everything which we have against Rome chimes in with the consciousness that we are true opponents of Rome only in so far as we are rooted in the knowledge of justification through faith in Christ, and we can accomplish something in this conflict only in so far as our mouths are opened by the assurance that we know the way by which a poor sinner can be certain that God is gracious to him.

God give us men who by reason of this assurance are ready to witness for this evangelical faith.

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### BIOLOGY AND RELIGION.

By Professor G. D. STAHLEY, A.M., M.D.

Judging from personal experience and observation, it is not a misstatement to say that there are many persons who do not have an adequate idea as to what the science of Biology really is, its scope, or the logical deductions which may be made from investigations on biological lines.

Biology is the science of life, and as all life is manifested through either plants or animals, a study of these, in their various forms and activities, constitutes the groundwork for the investigations and speculations of this science.

Biology is a comparatively new science, and the establishment of college and university chairs devoted to its interests, does not date further back than twenty-five or thirty years. There is a reason for the apparent newness of this science, but this is not because living things have not been studied for cen-

turies past, but because the microscope has given us a deeper insight into organic nature, because methods of investigation have changed, and because new and significant interpretations have been put on knowledge long since acquired, as well as on that which is more recent.

Zoology and botany, the study of animals and plants, respectively, began centuries ago. These branches were pursued systematically, and with more or less scientific accuracy, before either Chemistry, Physics or Geology, had any scientific value. To the Greek philosopher, Aristotle (384-322 B. C.), is accorded the honor of being the "father of natural history," as his writings on animals are the earliest known. He had both the philosophic and scientific spirit, and his works have value to this day. To show the truly scientific temper of his mind, in his *History of Animals*, he says: "We must not accept a general principle from logic only, but must prove its application to each fact; for it is in facts that we must seek general principles, and these must always accord with facts." It would be well if some of the so-called scientists of to-day, would hold this rule of Aristotle well in mind. From the time of Aristotle to the renaissance of the sciences in the 16th century, the study of animals made rather slow progress. From the 16th to to the 19th century, it made more rapid strides, and culminated in the advanced evolutionary declarations of Lamarck, Wallace, and Charles Darwin. Lamarck introduced the term Biology in the year 1802. Charles Darwin's epoch-making book on the *Origin of Species* appeared in 1859.

The modern study of plants and animals, is pursued along entirely different lines, and with different purposes, than was formerly the case. So long as life forms were studied for mechanical classification, to be duly labeled, and then to be placed carefully in the museum to gratify the meaningless curiosity of the passing spectator, no interest was aroused for either the investigator or on-looker. The objects were simply dead things, and had no stimulating significance. But when once naturalists became imbued with the thought that all organic forms were units in the life history of the universe, that they were viewing an organized historical procession, which had physical

correlations and genealogical ties, blood flowed more freely through thinking brains, interest in life and its conditions became greatly augmented, and hence came the new science of Biology, howbeit its field was still the same that Aristotle tilled.

In the infancy of our race, all natural phenomena were regarded as mysterious and unaccountable, and hence were referred to supernatural causes. Superstition and grotesque reasoning ruled the minds of men. Gradually light began to dawn and it became apparent that there was a reign of law in nature—that observed natural processes were subject to and controlled by specific laws and forces. When Newton discovered the law of gravitation, then human bewilderment in regard to the movements of stars and planets was replaced by clear thinking, and astronomy as a science was born. So the ascertained laws of the affinity of atoms established the science of Chemistry, and that surpassingly wonderful and revolutionizing law of the "correlation of forces," systematized the science of physics and permeated the entire universe of physical being. With considerable hesitation, but with final acquiescence, the dominion of law was admitted for all natural phenomena, save those associated with living nature. Life and all its manifestations were so mysterious, that the application of any known or knowable laws to its operations was regarded as impossible and even impious. Finally, the idea of the unity of the universe began to take possession of thinking men. Historical Geology, under the influence of Lyell, just before the middle of the last century, made clear the fact that the operation of present known physical laws and forces, continued through countless past ages, are sufficient to explain the history of the earth as we find it revealed to us in the rocky pages of earth's compact volume. Within these pages of stone were found the fossil remains of a past fauna and flora, thus adding life history to rock history. The transition to the next thought was easy—that if physical laws could account for the earth's geological record and for the life forms of the past, so intimately bound up with it, such laws would be sufficient to account for the continuance of life from those remote periods

even to the present time. Hence the study of Geology has given us the grand conception of the extention of the universe in time, and the study of Geology and Biology combined have given us that other grand conception of the *unity* of the universe; not a universe of unrelated aggregations, but a grand correlation of elements, phenomena and governing laws, which unify nature and add to its stupendous grandeur. That this unity is often made too much of, under the leadings of speculative philosophy, should not lead us to minimize its true importance.

This magnification of law may suggest that we desire to bow God out of the world and be satisfied with the study of material forces. This would certainly be a gross blunder and a stigma on Christian thinking. Laws and systems can never out-rank their source. Agnosticism surrounds itself with an opaque atmosphere of negations and says that upon existing evidence, conditioned on experience, the existence of a great first cause is unknown, and indeed unknowable. But a well grounded belief in the convincing truths of theistic and Christian doctrine, as declared through natural theology and revelation, impels us to the comforting conclusion that whatever variety or degrees of secondary causes may be found operative throughout the entire cosmic realm, their beginnings must have had a supernatural initiative. Not only this, but also that a divine imminence attends nature through all her operations.

A review of the human body, as a living organism, to see how far it is controlled by known laws, may be of advantage in this discussion. In a very important sense, the body is a mechanical contrivance for the conversion of one form of energy into another. As it does this according to mechanical and chemical laws, it therefore illustrates the law of the conservation of energy—the same law which obtains in a non-living universe. How far can this law be traced? The digestion of food is a chemical process, and the breaking down of stored food in the tissues is also chemical. By reason of the latter action, the energy of heat and motion is liberated—this active energy having previously resided as potential energy, in the particles of food eaten. This is the conversion of one form of



energy into another, it is a secondary phenomenon of life, and in years past was called "vital force." Without going unnecessarily into details, we may state in brief, that there are many other bodily functions, exhibiting forms of energy, which are properly classified as either mechanical or chemical. Even nervous energy can easily be proved to belong to the same category. Here, then, we have nervous energy and the energy of mechanical action and of heat and chemical affinity, exhibited by the human body and correlated with the unity of energy in the universe itself.

Now we come to two notable exceptions to these secondary phenomena as observed in the structures of the body. These activities are plain, and it is to the great credit of biologists that so much of the manifestations of life is reducible to known laws. The two puzzling exceptions are mental phenomena and the activity of the ultimate cell in carrying on important vital functions. The brain is the physical organ of the mind. As the brain and nerves develop, so do the mental powers. A nervous impulse is, of course, physical, and we can trace this to the brain, but we cannot conceive how a nervous impulse is converted into a conscious perception. It has not been proved that mental force is energy at all, and if it is not energy, it cannot be correlated with other forms, it is out of the physical category. And yet there are certain physical changes going on in the brain structure during periods of mental action, which are correlated with changes going on in other parts of the body. Several physiological facts have been definitely ascertained, *e. g.*, blood coming from the brain has a higher temperature than that going to the brain, it contains less oxygen and more carbon dioxide, hence it appears that potential energy has been converted into heat. An increased activity of thought or excitement of the mental state, is accompanied by a more rapid blood current through the brain. The more rapid chemical changes incident to this condition, show a rise of temperature detected by the thermo-electric apparatus applied to the outside of the head. The chemical changes going on in the active brain are accompanied by changes in the appearance of the cells of the gray matter, which are perfectly recognizable

under the microscope when cells from the brains of animals, killed after a night's sleep, are compared with cells from the brains of animals of the same species, killed after a day's activities. A writer aptly says: "That the cerebral changes which accompany the changing states of consciousness 'have not been discerned,' (as a critic alleges), is very certain. Men are not accustomed to do a large amount of thinking, with the roof of the skull removed, and with the brain placed under the microscope for the examination of its histological changes, or subjected to chemical reagents to detect the oxidation or other processes which may be going on in the minute laboratories of its cells. But that such changes are going on in connection with every process of thought or emotion is certain." Our universities do well in maintaining courses of study in physiological psychology, and it is not to the credit of any professing psychologist to attempt to disparage this phase of study, notwithstanding the separateness which exists between mental and physical phenomena.

The second exception in the category of correlated energies, as displayed by the human body, is found in the activity of the individual cell in bringing about muscular contraction, assimilation, secretion and the multiplication of cells to form tissues.

The individual cell consists of protoplasm, and this protoplasm has peculiar vital properties, by reason of which it inherently does things. In the fibers of muscles it causes contraction. In the cells of the digestive glands it elaborates a digestive fluid. In the waste and repair process, it institutes a chemical action, which results in waste products and the building up of new protoplasm from nutrient matter supplied. All this illustrates an inherent vital activity on the part of protoplasm itself. It is a living agent and its manifestations are not of the secondary order. It is a very complex substance. Chemically it is a proteid and is made up of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen and sulphur. Its complexity as a proteid is increased the more it is studied. Misled by its chemical nature, biochemists have essayed to make protoplasm, and thus solve the problem of the origin of life itself, for in protoplasm resides the incipency of life, in so far as science can have any-

thing to do with it. But protoplasm is not only a perplexing complex chemical compound, but it has been found that it has an intricate *mechanical structure*, by means of which most of its more wonderful activities are manifested. A cell is a drop or droplet of jelly-like protoplasm, and containing within it a denser portion of this material called the nucleus. The cell contents and nucleus are differentiated into *structural parts*, each of which seems to have its function in multiplying cells for the purpose of forming embryonal tissues. These structural parts move about among each other like animated chess men and display such mutual action and inter action, attraction and repulsion, such harmonious and apparently purposeful movements, as to elicit unbounded wonder and admiration. The result of this process is the multiplication of cells, and illustrates first steps in the building of organisms. Such marvelous directive action displayed by these integral parts of the cell, considered in connection with those other properties of its protoplasm—contractility and the waste and repair process—suggest the conclusion that the cell is, on its own account, a highly organized living machine. That the biochemist has thus far failed to manufacture in his laboratory such a marvelous substance as protoplasm, is not surprising, nor are there, at the present time, the remotest indications that his quest will ever be successful. This basic life-substance cannot, under present knowledge, be scientifically accounted for.

The great question which has given biology its importance and enthusiasm, is the question of the theory of evolution. It is not within the limits of this paper to discuss this question, but simply to give it statement, and place it fairly on its merits.

Aristotle, and other Greek philosophers before him, believed in the evolution of higher animals from lower. Evolution means the act of unfolding, and the term was first used by Von Baer, the embryologist, in 1832. In its first use it stood for the theory called "epigenesis," which meant that in the egg there existed in miniature, an organism precisely like the adult, but too small to be seen. This organism, by a process of simple growth, afterwards became the size of its parent. This interpretation of the egg after a while lost its supporters, and

then the term evolution, still confined to the history of the egg, meant that the fertilized egg cell, by the process of cell division, cell multiplication and cell differentiation, led finally to the well-formed embryo and then to the adult animal. Whilst the term evolution is now used in a much wider sense, this particular application of it, still holds good and is a magnificent illustration of the principles meant. It will bear a restatement:—The fertilized egg is a microscopic cell with its protoplasm and nucleus and structural parts—it is a *one-celled embryo*. By the process of division, already referred to, the single cell becomes two, and these by multiplication and remultiplication, by the same process, convert the one-celled embryo into a many-celled embryo. These many cells, by a vital process called differentiation or the making of like things unlike, are arranged into two and then into three layers of cells, the cells of each layer having acquired specific characters of their own. These layers now proceed to differentiate in their own direction, so that we now have three great groups of cells, each group destined to become modified into various sub-groups of tissues to form organs and the organism. Hence we have the steps—one cell, many cells, embryonal tissue, organs, systems of organs, organism. This is evolution, and very aptly illustrates the central thought. Whilst evolution still includes the history of the fertilized egg, the term is also used in a more extended sense; indeed it is used in a number of different senses, depending on the theoretical, philosophical, and often whimsical, ideas of its exponents. Biological writers, however, are quite agreed to mean by evolution that the life history of past and present is continuous, that the present species of plants and animals have been derived from past species, and that all future species will be evolved from the present ones. "Organic evolution" and the "theory of descent" are synonymous terms.

Speaking strictly from the scientific standpoint, evolution need have nothing to do with the origin of life, or of matter, or of first cause. It takes these things as it finds them and endeavors to ascertain historical sequence, facts in organic nature, and the laws and forces which seem to be in control. Tak-

ing facts as they seem to exist, and the laws which seem to obtain, the evolutionist concludes that there has been a continuity of life, a divergence of forms, and a gradual tendency to higher and more specialized organisms.

From simple to complex, from weakness to strength, from general to special, these are basic principles in the entire evolutionary history of the human race. From the bone needle of the savage, to the ball-bearing Singer, the principle of modification, adaptation and increased betterment, is easily traced. The history of man recorded, dates back but a few thousand years. During this time he has made marvelous progress in language-building, and in the various arts which go to make up civilization. The records of Archaeology and Geology point also to a prehistoric period for man, variously estimated to include from twenty to one hundred thousand years. Whether we study races, or language, or the arts of civilization, we find the level of advancement so great at the beginning of the historic period, that we are compelled to assume an immense stretch of time for that period of development of which we have no written record. The fundamental principle in all this record, historic and prehistoric, points to a long-extended continuity of forces, which beginning in simple conditions and intentions, have by slow degrees and persistent endeavor, wrought out for us the high privileges which our present times afford.

Two main questions present themselves—1st, Is the theory of evolution a fact? 2nd, What are its laws? Is it a fact that the present species of plants and animals have been derived by descent from previously existing species, or were the present species, at some remote time, created out of hand, and have come down to us unaltered in their own line of descent, and unaffiliated with any other line?

If we were to put the theory of the special creation of all species in diagramatic form, we might draw a series of straight upright poles, such as telegraph poles. Each pole would represent the beginning, the continuance and the present form of the original species. Classification on this basis would be an artificial one—merely putting like things together—without any regard for affinity or blood relationship. On the theory of

genetic descent, the diagram would represent a tree, with its trunk and branches. The trunk would stand for the original life form and the branches would represent phyla, orders, families, genera, species and varieties. The analogy is quite apt. The twig of this year constitutes the branch of next, and so on back to the trunk, where we find that the great branches were once the twigs of the young tree. The possibility of making a tree-like classification does not prove organic descent, but it throws great light on the subject when the facts in organic nature, as they have been so far observed, are largely in accord with this theory.

This genealogical classification, is the result of studies in paleontology, comparative anatomy, and embryology. The paleontological, or fossil history of organisms, is necessarily very imperfect. Only the hard parts of animals can thus be preserved, and the fossil remains are so inconveniently hid away in stratified rock, that they are usually obtained only by accident, in quarrying and road-making, and are seldom sought for with care and scientific deliberation. However, much has been learned from the fossil record. It has shown that the lower forms of life appeared first, and the more highly organized, later. Among the animals in general, the latest to appear were the vertebrates, and of these the mammals. Important genealogical material has been found, which traces our single-toed horse, back to a four-toed ancestor in eocene times. All the steps of this descent are impressively exhibited in the New York Museum of Natural history, at the present time. So, also, transitional fossil forms are found among the lower vertebrates. The earliest fishes were not typical fishes, but had both amphibian and reptilian characters. The first birds were not typical birds, but were so reptile-like in some of their features, that it is difficult to decide whether to call them reptilian birds or bird-like reptiles.

The study of comparative anatomy helps to substantiate the fact of evolution, because it gives an insight into the relationship of animals, and suggests that organisms must be governed by specific laws. In examining the skeletons of the different vertebrates, for instance, we soon become aware of homologies,

by which is meant that a common type structure is apparent, showing common descent with adaptive modifications. In this way, adaptive modifications to environmental conditions, are clearly traced in the fore-limbs of vertebrates, from fish to mammals. The hind-limbs are less specialized than the fore-limbs, but the modifications from the type form are still very apparent.

It is interesting to note the evolutionary steps in the formation of the eye. At first there is simply a collection of pigmented cells, connected by nerves and called an "eye spot," as in the star-fish, giving probably slight illumination but no image. The next step is a saucer-like depression of the pigment spot (as in Solen), then a cup-like depression (as in Limpet), then a still more cupped depression and having a pin-hole atop, so that for the first time a faint image occurs upon a retina (as in Nautilus). In the next step a transparent cornea closes up the pin-hole and a jelly-like refractive medium is inclosed (as in Snail). Lastly, as far as invertebrates are concerned, the lens appears and we have the fine camera eye of the Squid. From the latter, to the vertebrate eye, the structural relationships are also clear. As to the organ of hearing, the same rule of development, from simple to complex, is apparent, and can be traced from the simple membranous vestibular sac of many invertebrates, through the increasing complexity of the structural features pertaining to the inner, middle and outer ear of fishes, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals.

Embryology furnishes numerous facts which indicate the correctness of the theory of evolution. The Amoeba is the simplest animal possible and consists of a single cell. Volvox consists of many single cells arranged in a sphere. Hydra consists of many single cells arranged in two layers and is in the form of a sac. These are also the steps which mark the beginnings of all animals—the higher animals repeating in their very early embryonic stages, the same conditions which mark the adult period of the lowest of animal forms. Among vertebrate embryos, immediately after the typical vertebrate form has been assumed in the process of development, no difference can be discerned between the representatives of the various

classes—fishes, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals—they all look alike, and no one can affirm whether the outcome will be a tadpole or an elephant, a shark or a humming bird. As growth and development proceed, each embryo takes on more and more the form and features which belong to it, till finally the differentiations are complete. A few steps in the specializing process are important to note. In the earliest condition of each there are gill clefts and gill arches. These can be understood for fish and certain amphibians, but what use are gills to reptiles, birds and mammals? Accompanying the presence of gill arches, there is also a corresponding arrangement of blood vessels peculiar to fishes. As development proceeds, these gill arches disappear for all, except for fishes and certain amphibians, and the corresponding blood vessel arrangement becomes modified for each embryo, according to the class to which it belongs. At the end of the differential and developmental process, although the initial form and structure were the same, there is now exhibited by each, the features which place it definitely in its own class, order, family, genus and species. The point is here apparent, that in the development of the higher animals, there is a tendency to repeat stages common to lower groups, a fact which strongly indicates descent from such ancestral types. This brings us to the law—"The development of the individual is a recapitulation of the development of the race." The brain, also, of a high-grade mammal, shows this law of serial differentiation, in its individual embryological development. There is first an arrangement in the form and size of brain parts, which correspond to that of the lowest fishes, then follows in succession the brain form of the typical fish, amphibian, reptile, bird and low mammal, till finally the highly differentiated mammalian brain is reached. The term *phylogony* being used to indicate the evolution of the *race* from ancestral forms through modification or divergence of character, and the term *ontogony* being used to signify the embryological development of the *individual*, the principle in organic development is deduced that—ontogony is a repetition of phylogony.

I am well aware that the foregoing anatomical references,



constituting some of the reasons which biologists depend on to establish their conclusions, are not perfectly intelligible to all those who yet desire to have an opinion on the subject. In all fairness to the unalienable right of such persons, the suggestion ought not to be inappropriate, that this is one of the questions on which self-restraint in judgment, might be legitimately exercised. It is said that on one occasion, Mr. Huxley was approached by a clergyman and asked what line of study he should pursue in order to make himself more familiar with the subject of evolution. Mr. Huxley, knowing that his motives were sinister, told him to take a practical course in comparative anatomy. This settled the quest of the reverend gentleman, for he was not after truth.

When we come to the second important question pertaining to this subject:— What are the laws of evolution?—we find there is a great deal of agreement, along with considerable disagreement and warm discussion. The question covers a very wide and diverse field, and has many perplexing conditions. A bare statement of the broad ground occupied by the discussion, must here suffice.

The work of Charles Darwin (1809-1882) on "The Origin of Species by Natural Selection," is an attempt at explaining evolution on the principle stated, and hence the term "Darwinism" must be strictly confined to this mode as an explanation. But Natural Selection is no longer regarded as the only factor in species-building, hence the term "Darwinism" is not today regarded as a synonym for evolution. Darwin's non-theistic attitude is also objected to by the best scientists. Lamarck (1774-1829) had, before Darwin's time, formulated an explanation for the origin of new species, having for its chief factors—(1) the influence of physical environment on organisms—such as heat, and cold, dryness and moisture, etc., (2) use and disuse of organs and the inheritance of resulting changes. Darwin's explanation by "Natural Selection" included the factors—(1) prodigality in reproduction, (2) struggle for existence, (3) survival of the fittest, (4) sexual selection. The principle of selection is well known to man in a practical way, as in breeding horses for draught, speed or the road

From the ancestral jungle fowl have come, by artificial selection, all our varieties of domestic fowl, as Brahmas, Black Spanish, Bantams, Game Cocks, etc. Within the history of man, animals isolated on islands, coming into a new environment and cut off from crossing with companions of their species left behind, have in time developed entirely new species. By species the zoologist means—varieties which have become constant; varieties are simply incipient species. When once great differences appear in varieties, and the connecting forms have died out, then the term species is used.

During the past twenty-five years the battle ground has shifted to the subject of the origin of *variations*, for we must certainly have variations in organic forms, before we need to discuss the laws necessary to act upon them for species-making. This question of variations is a very perplexing one, and is being most elaborately discussed by expert thinkers on biological lines. To account for the progress of variations in species-building, the factors suggested by both Lamarck and Darwin are used along with other agencies which have more recently been brought forward. The factor of heredity in originating or continuing variations, has come into great prominence. The continuity of the germ plasm is advocated by Weissmann. He traces heredity through congenital variations, *i. e.*, those arising in the egg, and does not allow that offspring may inherit characters acquired by the parent during adult life. Numerous new questions arise as the discussion goes on. The search is intense, and as difficulties multiply the zeal of the workers increases.

That there are two fundamental laws at work in organic nature is definitely determined. The one is the law of *heredity* and the other is the law of *variation*. By reason of the first, species tend to produce offspring precisely like themselves, and because of the second, species tend to produce offspring unlike themselves. These laws seem paradoxical, but a little reflection will show that they are not. They constitute the present arena for biological gladiators. The whole question is apparently driven back to a study of cell protoplasm and nucleus.

Although the efforts to explain the initial causes of genetic

descent are still in contest and may never be concluded, yet the fact of descent itself seems to be pretty well established and admitted. There are those who seem to be instinctively, or by professional bias, opposed to the theory of organic evolution, and they gather up all the difficulties in the way and from these endeavor to prove its utter foolishness. They even make the mistake of not distinguishing between the fact and the laws which govern it. The existence of a considerable difference of opinion as to *mode*, ought not to be allowed to submerge the *fact*, which stands quite well corroborated. If the theory has not become absolutely axiomatic and beyond possibility of criticism, it simply shows that the question is still on a parity with most of the other great questions of the universe, which nevertheless elicit both our attention and our approbation.

There have been interjected into purely biological discussions, philosophical, metaphysical and theological questions, and these have tended to make the problem more complicated. They have added to the general interest, however, and whilst real knowledge has been advanced by them in many instances, in others sophistry and bad ethics have roamed rampant. Strictly speaking the question of organic evolution (and that is what we are here discussing) is a scientific one, and has to do simply with getting facts, classifying them and deducing principles. An eminent scientist has said that: "Science is, first, the gathering of knowledge through observation, and, second, the classification of such knowledge, and through this classification the deduction of general ideas and principles." If biologists went no further than this, they would be working in a proper domain of research, and their labors might be regarded as complete in the field which they undertake to cultivate. But the philosophical spirit which dominates all thinking minds, has led scientists to inquire and speculate as to the origin of matter and life—for visible substance and observed physical phenomena must have had a beginning somewhere. This has been the chase of centuries. Working on this line, the entire cosmos has been philosophically traced back to nebulae. From nebulae was evolved the great planetary system. From nebu-

læ came the inorganic earth itself. From nebulae, with its supposed unstable chemical compounds of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen and sulphur, by chemical affinity, came the living substance protoplasm. But this method is simply forcing the whole question back to the so-called "unknowable." Whence came the nebulae?

The theory of evolution cannot, in the broadest sense, be regarded as complete. Nor can any other of the great explanations of any part of the universe be so regarded. Biology cannot account for the first appearance of life on the globe. It insists that species were not independently created, but have been derived by divergence, from other species, on the principle of the genealogical tree. In tracing back this divergence, we must ultimately converge to a point in the remote past, when a single form of life gave the initiative to all succeeding forms. Spontaneous generation is depended on by non-theistic evolutionists to help them out on this point, but spontaneous generation has been entirely discredited by scientific experiments. The belief was greatly in vogue among the Greek philosophers, and even Aristotle believed that many animals, including even many highly organized forms, like frogs and insects, arose by spontaneous generation from the mud. By the middle of the seventh century these gross misapprehensions were ruled out of scientific thinking. Then came the discovery of those micro-organisms—bacteria, and a belief in spontaneous generation was again renewed. However, scientific investigations in the last century, after numerous rigid experiments and confirmatory testings, decided against the theory. This was a great disappointment to materialistic evolutionists, but that they gracefully acknowledged these negative conclusions, is greatly to their credit as truly scientific thinkers. However, some evolutionists who are dominated more by the philosophical than by the scientific spirit, still maintain that under the unusual circumstances and conditions which must have existed in the primordial period of the world's history, chemical affinities between elements *may have* produced spontaneous generation. This proposition can, of course, be neither established nor refuted.

Evolutionists are becoming more theistic than they once were. They discover that they cannot rule God out of the universe. There must be a first cause—a Creator. Nothing less than this will do. With this understanding, evolution simply becomes a *method of creation*. Instead of issuing a divine fiat, and creating instantly out of hand, animal or plant forms, which would serially and rigidly produce their own kind, with no possibility of genetic divergence, His great creative power was exercised in originating primordial life and in giving it a material setting, endowing it with infinite potentialities of progress, differentiation and development. To the human mind this conception cannot but be awe-inspiring, and calculated to accentuate our ideas of the infinite wisdom and power with which we reverently regard our God. Erasmus Darwin, the grand-father of Charles Darwin, published a medico-philosophical treatise on evolution in 1794, and lest he should appear irreverent in preferring evolution to the view of special creation, he says: "For if we may compare infinities, it would seem to require a greater infinity or power to cause the causes of effects, than to cause the effects themselves; that is, to establish the laws of creation, rather than to directly create."

There is an idealistic evolutionary philosophy, which makes God resident in and part of the developing processes of nature, and does not recognize Him apart from this integral essence. This is monistic pantheism, and cannot but be subversive of the best interests of a sound Christianity. It is certainly true that God is imminent in the work of His own hands, and by original impress, manifested through secondary causes, guides the unfoldings of nature. But God is also a free personality, distinct from nature—a spiritual *ego*, capable of revealing himself to human beings, they being also free personalities and capable of independent action. It will be a sad day for the human race when the God of revelation and of nature is shut out—when supernatural providential care, is withdrawn, and intercessory petitions are declared obsolete.

A belief in some form of organic evolution is now quite prevalent among intelligent people. It is true there seem to

be some who have not yet put on their thinking caps in regard to this subject, and others whose puerile fear for the stability of the eternal principles of truth, prevents them from investigating the question. As for those who have formed an intelligent opinion, their judgment approves of the principle in general, and they make ready application of it in regard to the animal creation below man, but cannot include the "lord of creation," for he "doth so bestride this narrow world like a Colossus," that they seem afraid to inquire into his family history. The question of genetic descent with divergence in species-forming being admitted, the limitations of its application are matters of personal judgment and are always allowed and respected. But the principle being once accepted, as a method in the unfolding of organic nature, it is difficult to see how we can logically draw the line at *Genus Homo*. In zoological terms man is a mammal—he belongs to the fifth class in the vertebrate series. His type structure is the same as that of other mammals, modified of course, in adaptative relationship to his environment.

Man is usually regarded as consisting of body, soul and spirit. Soul signifies the life principle, which began when living matter was first created, and is possessed by the entire animal kingdom. Spirit is the supernatural element in man's nature, bestowed upon him by special creation, at that period of his perfected animal development when God said: "Let us make man in our own (divine) image." The body is the corporeal part, and includes the brain, which latter is the seat of mind or spiritual essence. The spirit is the endowed and elevated soul. The paucity or abundance of the cellular gray matter in the cortex of the brain, conditions dull or clear mental action. Disintegration of cell structure, with the evolution of heat, accompanies thought processes. There has been much philosophical reasoning to demonstrate the evolution of man's abstract reasoning powers from animal intelligence. It cannot well be denied that there are instances of animal intelligence which show a low grade of reasoning. Whatever the ultimate physical status of the question may become in its evolutionary aspect, one thing seems certain, that the "correla-

tions between states of consciousness and cerebral changes are utterly disparate and incommensurable."

The unfolding of the mental processes must have been very gradual, and the period in prehistoric times, when abstract reason became efficient, is impossible to determine. An analogy seems to suggest itself when comparing the phylogenic or race history, with the ontogenic history or history of the individual. In watching mental development, as exhibited by the growing child, it is impossible to determine the exact time when the power to think for wise self-direction is efficiently acquired. To reason so as to evolve principles and formulate laws is a growth. The power of abstract thinking may not be well developed in some minds otherwise well educated. The primitive mind was simple, but efficient for the simple conditions of our concrete world.

The presence of rudimentary structures in the body of man and the higher animals, is regarded as good evidence in favor of evolution. These rudiments are remnants of organs which are now useless, but in lower forms were of great utility. So many have been found in man that a writer has called him a "museum of rudiments." As examples of these now useless organs, we mention the muscles to move skin and ear, the third eyelid, and the appendix. The latter was once a useful part of the digestive apparatus, but its only present use seems to be to give us trouble.

Some uninformed persons, who persist in limiting their grasp on live questions, declare that the sum total of the theory of evolution is that "man came from a monkey," and their sage advice to their neighbor is—never to admit such a possibility. Says a learned anthropologist: "No competent anatomist, who has examined the body structure of anthropoid apes, considers it possible that man can be descended from any of them, but according to the doctrine of descent, they appear as the nearest existing offshoots from the same *primitive stock* whence man also came." It will be observed that no claim is made (and it never has been made) that we belong to the same household, but that perhaps we are cousins very "far removed." It does not stimulate my racial pride to know that in all prob-

ability I am very many thousand times more nearly related to the most revolting criminal tramp I ever saw, than I am to a well-behaved anthropoid ape. As to weight of brain, the difference between the savage and the civilized man is far greater than between the savage and the highest ape. It seems apparent that man's activity in the civilizing processes has developed his brain, not only in weight, but in increase of gray matter and in regional markings indicative of cerebral localizations and complexity of mental power.

Studies in anthropology are extremely interesting. The so-called "ages" of stone, copper and iron exhibit implements and human and animal remains which have added wonderfully to our knowledge of man's early, crude beginnings in the arts of civilization. Crania, which have been unearthed at different times, show types to which expert comparative anatomists have attached great importance in the study of primitive man. In regard to the famous Neanderthal skull, the conclusion is that it is human, but with decided ape-like characters, and is supposed to belong to one of the wild races of north-western Europe spoken of by Latin writers. The most recent find is that of *Pithecanthropus erectus*, and the conclusion in this case is that the skull is "not human, but represents a form intermediate between man and the higher ape." At the present time, however, the whole question of the origin of primitive man, from the evolutionary standpoint, is very obscure, and needs much additional and confirmatory proofs, before conclusions can be definitely made.

Irrespective of the question of anatomical continuity between man and some previously existing animal form, there is a strong tendency in some quarters to construct impassable barriers between the races of men themselves. A distinguished theologian who recently returned from a trip to India, where he had gone to study social and religious questions writes: "I was impressed most deeply by the essential unity of the human race, a proposition readily granted in theory and denied in practice, so slow is the disposition of the western world to believe the race of man is one." The present menacing "race question" suggests the thought that we are not accepting the fact of the



oneness of humanity in as Christian a spirit as we should. And the case is greatly aggravated when a minister of the gospel feels called upon to formulate arguments setting forth his belief that a Negro has no soul. This covert tendency on the part of many to ignore moral obligations in our human brotherhood, has a serious aspect in the domain of Christian ethics, and is a much more vital point to be troubled about than the granting of the anatomical origin of primitive man.

Much useless discussion was had many years ago, when Geology asserted its belief that our earth was millions of years in forming, thus contradicting the Mosaic record of six days. This contention has ceased long ago, and there is no theologian at the present time who has a reputation to maintain, but has wisely come to the conclusion that the Bible is not a scientific treatise, but a revelatory book for man's moral and spiritual redemption. A writer truthfully says, that the first chapter of Genesis "is a profoundly thoughtful conception of the cosmos." It has no scientific value, however, and was not intended to have. It is a "majestic psalm of praise to God as the Creator of the universe," and was a notification to pagan nations that the objects in nature which they worshipped were not gods, but were themselves made by the one true God whom they should serve. The creation of the first man and of animals immediately out of the ground, is a rapid survey of a prolonged history; and the story of the first woman formed out of a rib of her consort, is apparently allegory. The story of the Fall, in which the speaking serpent and the forbidden fruit play such a prominent rôle, is probably a symbolic statement. It is but natural that Moses should have written in the primitive nomenclature of his day, reflecting the current mode of thought-expression and incorporating traditional sayings, under a spiritual superintendence, affecting pure ethical and monotheistic conceptions, which is the object of the biblical story. The theory of organic evolution presupposes immense periods of time—millions of years—for this *method of creation* to work out its genetic unfoldings, and the stony pages of earth's history amply attest the past existence of these vast stretches. "A thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday"—which

is the same as saying that millions of years are infinitesimal to Him in his vast operations.

The fact that some of the above conclusions are not compatible with a belief in the *verbal* inspiration of the Scriptures should not cause any alarm at this time when the theory of dynamic inspiration satisfies the Christian mind and accords with divine revelation.

Objection is often made to the dogmatic claims of scientific writers, and the charge is sometimes well sustained. Yet we are of the opinion that dogmatism is a frailty of the human mind, and is not characteristic of any particular class of thinkers. Theologians well know that the arrogant assertions of opinions and the untempered discussion of man-made doctrines, have been detrimental to the best spiritual interests of the Church throughout its entire history.

The charge of materialism is often urged against the theory of evolution, and an attempt is made to discredit it on that account. There are evolutionists of this class, but materialism is not at all necessary to the theory, and it is becoming more and more displaced by theistic beliefs. The principles of "Bryanism" do not inherently characterize the Democratic party, nor does the spirit of materialism necessarily belong to evolution. So great and independent a thinker, and so competent a comparative anatomist as Mr. Huxley, could not make materialism an essential part of the theory of organic descent.

Biological studies have got to be so important a part of general culture, and so interwoven with all intelligent thinking, whatever the department of learning we may consider, that it is no longer wise to ignore them. Least of all can the science of theology afford to set them aside. Yet it is often apparent that biological questions—questions having to do with the fundamental processes of nature, growth, development, specializations in structure and function, etc.—are still looked upon as weird, irrelevant and impertinent. I have had the experience of educational committees of synods objecting to their wards taking up biology as an elective in college studies. If this is an illustration of the attitude of theology to biology, then Hugh Miller was right when he said that "theology was always fifty

years behind science." However, I am pleased to believe that my experience may have been exceptional, rather than the rule. A proper conservatism is certainly commendable, for science should be compelled to give good reasons for every step it takes; but theological students should be allowed such educational opportunities as may qualify them to consider and give an intelligent opinion on the facts as offered by science. Anyone desiring to understand pomology, must himself, either engage actively in the raising of fruit, or be closely associated with those who do.

There are those who are constantly fearing the dethronement of truth, and spend their entire lives in endeavoring to throw around it a protecting stockade of ill-timed protests. One is reminded of Uzzah, the son of Abinadab, whose meddlesome concern for the ark of the Lord cost him his life. If, in these days, all the self-constituted fussy conservators of God's ark should meet with a like penalty, one might reasonably expect a greatly increased death rate in certain quarters.

Biology does not teach materialism, and evolution, which is its main feature, is neither atheistic or non-theistic, except in so far as individuals may use their personal judgment to make it so. The supernatural is admitted in evolutionary thinking. To the Christian evolutionist, the transcendent miracles of the incarnation, resurrection and ascension of our Lord, are admitted factors in the great scheme of human redemption. So also those miracles in the Old Testament which attest the Mosaic and prophetic dispensations, and those in the New which confirm the genuineness of Christ's mission, are recognized as truly supernatural manifestations in the establishment of a revealed religion for man. Not falling under any of the above categories, it ought not to be regarded as a serious offense if the so-called miracle of "Jonah and the whale" is called simply a symbolic narrative, or a parable with a moral lesson, anticipating Paul's assertion that God is not "the God of the Jews only," but "of the Gentiles also." Or perhaps the lesson taught is, that we should not expect to escape duties explicitly and providentially imposed. The story as history is grotesque, and has no *a priori* probability; however, as a parable, it

teaches most useful lessons, and that should satisfy the devout inquirer.

The account of Adam's Fall, as given in the second chapter of Genesis, cannot refer to literal events, but nevertheless the *doctrine* of the Fall remains untouched. When man arrived at that stage of his animal development that God saw fit to create within him his divine image, he at that time became possessed of boundless possibilities for development in right directions, but his first sin marred this glorious possibility and forever limited the fulfillment of that perfection which originally was intended to be his. In this curse of limitation we do all participate.

There is an element of man's conduct which shows wrong promptings in his nature, and which may be attributed to his "brutish inheritance." This cannot be made to stand for the doctrine of "original sin"; yet when one sees excited and angry physical encounters among rational men, does it not suggest that these are manifestations of surviving animal instincts, such as are commonly displayed among brutes? Even when this fighting instinct is clothed in the color and pageantry of military display, the conviction is still strong that, but for this "brutish inheritance," the sweet reasonableness of arbitration and of continued peace would universally prevail.

There is, therefore, no necessary contention between biology and religion. They have always been at one, and whenever an apparent difference has existed, it was because extremists on both sides have obscured the atmosphere of reason with irrelevant propositions and conclusions. When extreme material scientists and antiquated theologians lock horns, the contest is necessarily fierce. Religion itself is transparent, sweet and amiable, but in the endeavor to systematize its teachings and convert it into a science, the varying minds of the theological builders often read into it most marvelous statements which create contentions, not only with scientists, but among theologians as well.

It is fortunate that among theologians there are always a goodly number who keep thoroughly abreast with the times. Those only can do this who have by nature a generous brain

endowment, and who, by habits of study, innate and acquired, take strong hold on living questions cognate to their own science, and with steady mental poise compare, discuss and conclude. Such men are invaluable. They put to shame those evading representatives of their class who, from lack of either knowledge or courage, refrain from the discussion of all scientific questions.

Whatever other qualities may be desirable in our mental and spiritual make-up, it seems to me that these three are essential—we should be thoughtful, sensible and religious. Genuine thoughtfulness is the first requisite of all profitable endeavor. Common sense regulates and conditions the usefulness of all thinking. A religious disposition and practice gives a mellowness and sanctity to person and purpose. I respectfully ask for biological questions, that they be accorded no other courtesies than those which may ensue from the exercise of the above qualities. This request will exclude bias, superficial and hap-hazard opinions; it will make impossible ridiculous assertions and inane inferences; it will insure serious, conscientious inquiry—and this is all that any cause can ask for.

## ARTICLE IV.

## MODERN EVANGELISM.

BY L. L. SIEBER, D.D.

The *word* evangelism is generally used as a synonym for revival, and the great revival periods in the history of the Church can be easily recognized as evangelistic.

Revival refers rather to the aim and effect of the movement, while evangelism refers more strictly to the means used to produce results. Evangelistic preaching confines itself more strictly to the simple gospel message of salvation for the lost, with the expectation of immediate, rather than remote, results. The evangelist, like the sharp-shooter, takes deliberate aim, and is not content with the general fusillade that is as likely to shoot into the sky or into the ground, as to strike the enemy. He has implicit confidence in the "weapon of his warfare," which is not carnal but spiritual, the "Sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God."

In this respect the word evangelist and the work of the evangelist often differs radically from the word revival and the work of so called revivalists. The true evangelist is "determined to know nothing in his work but Jesus Christ and Him Crucified." The fearful reality of sin and its inevitable consequences, "the wages of sin is death," the destruction of all good in this life and in the life to come. He is not content with culture, refinement, polite society, nor with social morality, but emphasizes the Word on this one point, "the soul that sinneth it shall die." In this respect the evangelist and the revivalist are alike intense. But they may differ as the name implies, in the use of means. The evangelist studies the message and the application of it to the lost soul, with a view to its redemption; he is not so much interested in methods. He has invented no stereotyped place or plan, no localized salvation in former experience that should insure peace to the penitent

but has magnified the Pauline doctrine of "*justification by faith alone*."

Whether preached by pastor or layman, with or without ecclesiastical robes, fine pulpit or secular platform, by an educated or uneducated ministry, on the Lord's Day, according to divinely appointed order, or on week day or night, salvation is to him that receiveth and believeth the message. The evangelist has thoroughly divorced faith from form, peace from place, power from mere priest, and has brought to the front the two vital and final principles of the Gospel dispensation: "Let him that heareth *say come*, and whosoever will *may come* and take the water of life freely."

Evangelism has developed practically, what Luther brought to light doctrinally, the universality of the priesthood. The times of Joel and Peter have come, when God has poured out His Spirit upon *all* flesh, and his sons and his daughters are prophesying, young men are seeing visions and old men are dreaming dreams.

The scope of this article is intended to embrace *The Need*, *The Nature*, and *The Effects of Modern Evangelism*.

The great spiritual waves which have periodically passed over the Church of God from the beginning seem to have been, according to the divine plan, based upon human, if not divine, necessity.

According to human wish and wisdom the ideal state of the kingdom would be that of the vision of waters in Ezekiel, with a gradual deepening and widening flow, sweeping with healing, triumphant power toward the sea, giving life and abundant salvation to all in its grand sweep. And this must be the divine ideal in the mind of the author of a world-wide, race-wide salvation. But to our human vision the evolution of the Church and of the Kingdom has rather resembled the ebb and flow of the majestic sea, now overflowing with refreshing, life-giving waters, then leaving for a time the barren beach scattered with wreck and ruin.

This was the sad history of God's ancient people. *Departure* and *return* was the long experience, exile and restoration, idols

and Jehovah, darkness and light, defeat and victory, alternated, as though in the divine plan. Egypt and Jerusalem, Babylon and Zion until the "fullness of time had come," and even now under the full-orbed day of the Sun of Righteousness, God's own peculiar people are stricken with blindness until the time of the Gentiles is fulfilled.

In Christ's own work and mission there was this action and reaction, this defeat and victory, now all the world followed after Him, again all forsook Him and fled; now He exercises His authority, driving the money-changers out of the temple and dedicates it to His Father's service; again He barely makes His escape from their murderous hands; upon the very heels of the triumphal entrance into the city came the desertion of the disciples, the arrest, the mock trial, the shameful crucifixion and the blighted hopes of his scattered followers. The preachers but recently graduated from the best divinity school the Church ever knew are become skeptics and unbelievers. Can ever such crushed hopes be revived, or such buried pretense have a resurrection of confidence and assurance? Can "truth crushed to earth rise again," and will the eternal years of God be really Hers? But is not all this vacillating, unstable spirit only the preparation and evidence of the need of the Third Person of the Trinity to establish once and forever the unflinching perennial faith, without which the Church must ever remain an imbecile? "Ye shall have power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you," was the promise that gave hope in the midst of despair. The ushering in of the dispensation of the Spirit, the conversion of the thousands, the awe inspiring signs and wonders of apostolic times surely can never know discouragement and defeat. And yet after the gospel triumphs of the Apostolic and Early Church came the Dark Ages. Christ crucified afresh and put to an open shame, the melting story of sacrificial love hidden amid the rubbish of human devices. The new dispensation to save our frail humanity is but the dispairing repetition of the old. The chained Bible is but a type of the chained hearts and minds of the misguided and superstitious Church of our Lord, despite the gift of the Holy



Ghost. Her only hope again is a spiritual resurrection from the dead, an actual protest against death, a deliverance from the bondage of a form of godliness that knew not the power of it; a revival of the Spirit who abides in the Church and in the Word and needs but to be sought and prayed for and received that we might have life and that we might have it more abundantly. This stupendous awakening of the sixteenth century is the type of all true revivals. There was the feeling of need, the anxiety for deliverance, the Gospel of the atonement for sin preached with the demonstration of the Spirit as the means of restoration. We cannot imagine what would be the political, social and religious condition of the world today had not this mighty reaction in the Kingdom of God taken place. All civil and religious liberty had its birth and hope of development in this change. In this freedom of thought and conscience were made possible all the gigantic strides in science and invention, in the civil liberty and fraternity of nations that make the whole world kin.

After such a marvelous deliverance in the Reformation period, embracing almost two centuries, beginning in the fourteenth and extending into the sixteenth, could the veriest pessimist prophesy that Rationalism and French Infidelity would again so soon unsettle the faith of the Church and sap the very foundations of her faith and hope, so that the fashionable upper class would sneer at the Bible and cause the hearts of the faithful to tremble and fail within them? Yet these very things were fulfilled before the eyes of the Church; but they called forth a long list of defenders and champions of the faith who with true evangelist zeal withstood all their hellish darts. Such men as Bunyan and Baxter of the seventeenth century, and Whitefield and Wesley, Edwards and Brainard and the Tennants of the eighteenth century. It was these fearless defenders of the *Gospel message* and these flaming evangelists of the truth, that drove back the insidious Rationalism that paralyzed the arm of the Church, brought to naught the assaults of Paine and Voltaire, and made it possible for our dear, departed century, the nineteenth, to be born amidst religious revivals that swept

almost half way through the century. This mighty tidal wave of spiritual power carried upon its crest the organization of a number of the most remarkable societies of modern times, such as the Religious Tract Society, The British and Foreign Bible Society, The London Missionary, and The Church Missionary Societies; the first society for the evangelizing of the heathen, and the Baptist Foreign Missionary Society. All these had their birth amidst this strenuous evangelistic, revivalistic spirit. When the enemy came in like a flood then the Lord raised up a standard against them. A brilliant galaxy of names appears upon the ecclesiastical heavens at this time: The younger Edwards, Dwight, Livingston, Nettleton, Lyman Beecher and others who introduced a true pietistic trend that swept like a flaming sword over the Church.

The Spirit of God manifested himself in different parts of the country at the same time, until there began an unbroken series of revivals that swept over the New England States, Pennsylvania and Virginia, and extended through most of the northern and western states. Many of these heroes left the settled pastorates with adequate support and gave themselves for years to the labors and hardships of the evangelist. In New England alone more than one hundred and fifty churches were visited by special demonstrations of the Spirit at the same time, and thousands of souls were brought into the Kingdom to become the foundations of the mighty intellectual and spiritual power of the future Church.

These men dealt not so much in polemics, but fearlessly exposed sin in men's hearts and lives, thrusting the two edged sword of the Gospel to the quick, penetrating to the joint and marrow, until it became a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Then with the most tender affection they applied the blood of the atonement as the only divinely appointed remedy for sin. For over twenty years the godly Nettleton gave his body and soul to this special work of seeking the lost. Seven years he labored in Connecticut, accomplishing remarkable results. Most of the large and influential churches of New England were in those early days baptized into this Spirit.

The name of Charles G. Finney, the specially chosen instrument of God, represented the highest type of evangelist in those days. Born into the kingdom upon his knees, snatched from a secular home and from a secular profession, baptized not only for salvation but for service, he started out upon a most marvelous career of soul winning. Often spending days without eating and nights without sleeping, his weakness became the power of God until salvation in the hands of God. The entire State of New York was directly or indirectly influenced by his power. New York City was visited in 1831 by this pietistic wave until every church in the city was crowded with praying and penitent souls, and old Chatham Street Theater was transformed into a house of prayer, and for three years the building was a constant scene of evangelistic services. During this remarkable period of nearly fifty years (from 1792 to 1842) from four to five hundred churches were annually visited by this outpouring of the Spirit, and from forty to fifty thousand were added to the Church in a single year.

The great centers of education did not escape this visitation of the Spirit.

At Oberlin there was a period of five years during which there was a continuous manifestation of the power of God to save men. The theological recitations were turned into prayer and inquiry meetings, and students met in the most informal way to sing and pray.

Amherst, under Dr. Humphrey, was visited by a great awakening which lasted from 1827 to 1831, the effect of which permeated her life for a quarter of a century.

Dartmouth was under the mighty sway of evangelism for ten years, when almost the entire student body was brought to Christ, nearly all of whom gave themselves to the ministry or to the missionary work.

Princeton was baptized at the same time with such power that the secular days were turned to Sabbaths of solemnity and heart-searchings, until it was said there was not a room that was not a place of prayer and consecration.

Yale's baptism of fire began with the presence of Edward

Beecher, when the entire college was transformed and began a new era of power and usefulness. No mind could calculate the influence for God and for good that this salt of salvation in the centers of power has wielded for the proper development and perpetuity of our country. If our higher education be not Christian, it but sharpens the instruments of the nation's destruction. Our own older Lutheran colleges were all born, baptized and confirmed under these same pietistic influences, and were founded with the chief end of furnishing the Church with an adequate and thoroughly furnished ministry. Entire classes graduated in the college and resumed their studies in the theological department. Many who had not fully decided their profession upon entering the college, were swept into the Kingdom and to a decision for the ministry during the special seasons of grace in college. In the great awakening at Gettysburg in '72 and '73 only two of the student body were able to resist the pathetic preaching and the earnest prayers of Christian professors and fellow-students. It is said that nine-tenths of the ministry of those days were called into the service under special evangelistic influences.

The greatest evangelistic movement since the days of the apostles, with perhaps the single exception of the Reformation period of the 16th century, was that which began in 1857 and continued almost unabated for a quarter of a century. It originated on the basis of *God* versus *Gold*. When California revealed her yellow treasures to the greed of men, thousands left home and friends and God to claim the prize. Following the scramble and craze and speculation of the early Fifties, there came such a crash and reaction into the financial life of the nation that millionaires became bankrupt by the scores and in their extremity began to call upon the God they had forsaken and bartered for the world, the flesh and the devil. The Fulton street prayer meeting for business men was inaugurated at midday in New York city, whose spiritual contagion soon spread over the city and to other cities, until a "Stock Exchange" for Christ was opened in every important city in the land, with telegraphic communication bearing the good news of

the value of new born souls. Fulton street and the Farwell Hall meeting of Chicago have held daily services without an omission to this day. This was possibly the first Layman's movement where the Church anteceded the Clergy in the great cry after God. The Y. M. C. A. was inaugurated in Chicago; the God sent and immortal Moody began his word-embracing career; the largest numbers known to the Christian world were gathered together in the name of religion, and a man without the prescribed church training or human ordination vows led the people to Christ by thousands. Mr. Moody verified the almost inspired remark of the English Evangelist, Mr. Henry Varley: "It remains yet for the world to see what the Lord can do with a man wholly consecrated to Christ."

His marvelous work, under God, in Scotland and Ireland, in England and America, has marked an epoch in the history of Christianity. It has developed the possibility and glorious results of the federation of the Clergy and the Church in the evangelization of the masses, has brought to light the responsibility of every man for his brother and has awakened lay activity, which is the joy and benediction of Christianity today. It is worthy of note that along with this strenuous hand to hand fight for souls there have arisen The International S. S. Work, the Y. M. C. A. Work, The Christian Endeavor Society, The Rescue Mission Work, The Evangelical Alliance and the Bible Conferences, each of which compass the globe, with their sympathetic fraternal bonds, answering in large measure the prayer of the Master: "That they all may be one \* \* \* That the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." Jno. 17 : 21.

Now at the close of such a remarkable century, could we expect the faintest signs of reaction? Must it be that history will repeat itself, and at the end of such triumphs, the Church should be guilty of apathy and indifference, and that her very successes should make her self-sufficient, that her wealth and her magnificent architecture should become a snare, that she should pride herself in rich offerings for missions and charities, and become barren of power to win souls for the Kingdom? Careful watchmen upon the walls of Zion are discerning these

signs of the times; painstaking statisticians have proved this barrenness from the reports of Synods and Presbyteries, and are showing that when the Church ceases to be evangelistic and revivalistic she does not fulfill the divine commission, that when souls are not added to the Church proportionate to her opportunity the period of decay begins. We cannot live of the manna gathered yesterday. The Church of God must gather "day by day," or suffer want.

The *world* as well as the *Church* is putting this condition into phrases like these: "The Eclipse of Faith," "The Decline of Orthodoxy," "The Waning of the Church," "The Acknowledged Fallability of the Bible," etc. "The Higher Criticism" in our theological seminaries, with outspoken denial of what was once held sacred, and the general weakening along the line of the ministry, have done much to destroy real positive preaching. Dr. Briggs has had many open followers and still more secret ones. When Dr. Cadman of the Metropolitan Temple, New York, before a large body of ministers of his Church, made the statement a few years ago, "that the absolute inerrancy and infallibility of the Bible are no longer possible of belief among reasoning men," he was enthusiastically applauded. The heresy trials, and the toleration of extremely liberal views in different Protestant Churches has done much to neutralize the effect of the Gospel in the winning of souls. The easy drift of pastors into professional chairs, to lecture platform, into secretaryships of Boards of the Church, whose work becomes largely secular, and even into purely secular pursuits, indicates indifference to the proclamation of the message for the salvation of the lost—in shameful contrast with the exclamation of the Apostle: "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel."

The indifference (and often the criticism) of a large part of the ministry toward evangelistic work, both in our theological seminaries and pastorates, men renouncing the very means which gave them spiritual birth and a call to the ministry, substituting what they claim to be more refined and cultured methods, gradually putting on the cold and formal vestments of the ritualist, the fight for external uniformity instead of in-

ternal harmony—these things signalize the beginning of inevitable paralysis, as history has many times verified. Thus the clergy, in many instances, are leading the way into a labyrinth of doubt, and into an atmosphere of ease and self-indulgence from which the Lord must again deliver the Church.

Along with this deflection of the ministry there is an undoubted trend of the wealthy and cultured congregations toward ritualism and worldliness and a demand for a ministry who will spare them with the preaching of a palatable gospel.

An editorial in one of the most reliable and conservative papers in New York city declared that, "never before has it been so evident as it is now that a sweeping Revival of Religion is necessary to save many churches of different denominations in New York from falling into religious indifference, which must be destructive to their spirituality, unless it be overcome by such extraordinary means." As evidence, the writer refers to the condition of several of the leading Presbyterian churches that once were the glory of Presbyterianism. He refers to the passing of Dr. John Hall, who for almost half a century fed this magnificent church upon the simplicity of the Gospel. The great preacher remained the same, but the tastes of the people so changed that they were unable to find a man who could satisfy their fastidious tastes. Several other prominent churches are mentioned, which were for years fed upon the "sincere milk of the Word," but now are seeking after "star preachers" who would fill the pews and the treasuries.

The explanation was that pew-holders had actually served notice upon the authorities that their contributions would be withheld after a certain date. "The people of large means are drifting away"—an actual bribe against sound doctrine and true spirituality.

"Though much of the wealth of the city was once found in these evangelistic churches, it is now more congenial to the social tastes and ambitions of an increasing number of families of this sort to adhere to a more liturgical church." This state of things is not confined to a single city nor denomination. The canny candidating of important churches in these days is

either a great reflection upon the professors in our theological seminaries in the preparation of young men for the ministry, or upon the average ministry, or the Church is sadly afflicted with "itching ears." The secular editorial has properly discerned the only remedy—"a sweeping revival of pure and undefiled religion." The Church is unduly magnifying the *human* element in the ministry, voice and manner and even personal appearance, a fine presence, eloquence and grace, and leaving too little room for the operation of the Spirit through the Word as proclaimed by any sincere servant, though "his bodily presence be weak and his speech contemptible"; ignoring too much the fact that the power and success of any church lies largely in the consecrated lives of its membership in illustrating the incarnate Gospel.

A recent letter, written by a prominent professor in one of our theological seminaries, described the activity of a committee appointed by a vacant congregation, in their persevering search for a minister capable and worthy to fill so important a vacancy, indicating their determination to spare neither time nor energy until the proper man be found. Can it be that the simple story of the cross is so difficult to proclaim, or is the law of adaptation of so great importance? Are we of Paul, or of Appolos, or of Cephus, or of Christ? This searching committee may spend the largest part of a year before it secures the proper fit. The professor could hardly fail to see the sad reflection upon himself and his seminary where he has been helping to prepare the Lord's prophets for thirty years.

If the need of a special spiritual awakening is indicated both by our ministry and our churches, a still louder call comes from the alarmingly meagre results in actual gains for the Church from the world.

In our anxiety for church buildings and large revenues, we have overlooked the great commission: "Go! make disciples." In the aggregate, even these figures may not be so disheartening, but when compared with the capital invested, both in brains and money, the results are painfully small. In a ministers' meeting in Philadelphia several years ago, the startling



results were announced. Of the twelve hundred thousand souls in the district, less than one hundred and fifty thousand were identified with the churches, leaving more than one million outside. With all the machinery and organization and invested capital and annual outlay of money and mental and moral energy, there is a gain of less than one per cent. of the population.

Dr. Carson, of New York, after careful investigation, declares in a sermon, "that there are 900,000 people in New York who are absolutely untouched by anything that can be called a church."

"At the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, held in St. Louis in 1900, of the 7,875 congregations, 1,599 reported no accessions by profession of faith. The average additions from the world by profession of faith were less than seven to each congregation for the entire year." Is it strange that since then this great church has organized for a systematic evangelistic movement, at great expense, to cover the entire denomination? The Congregational Church the same year, with nearly 6,000 congregations, reports an average per congregation of  $4\frac{1}{3}$  by profession of faith, with 1,951 congregations reporting no accession from the world. This does not include additions by letter, which are only transfers, and not gains from the world. The Baptist churches average about  $4\frac{1}{4}$  for each congregation for the year. These statistics do not include quite a number of churches from which there was no report at all.

At the meeting of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in Baltimore in 1902, the reports show 1,691 congregations adding 1,830 by adult baptism, or an average of 1 1-16 accessions from the world for each congregation for the entire year; but, adding the number of confirmations, which are, strictly speaking, simply promotions from infant membership to adult membership, the average becomes 7 13-16 per congregation for the entire year. This same report shows, adding all gains and subtracting all losses, a net gain of 7,618, or an average net gain per church of 4 3-5.

To bring about these results there is a force of 1,112 ministers, 1,691 congregations, over 255,000 communicant members, with an expenditure of almost 1½ million dollars for the year.

The great Methodist Church, in her Year Book for 1903, makes the proud statement that the Conferences for 1902 show a net increase of nearly 50,000 members, and yet when you divide this number by the number of churches they will average a little less than 2 for each congregation; and by figuring a little further you will discover that with almost three million communicant members it requires sixty members, in addition to the pastors, a whole year to make one convert, with an investment in church property of over \$146,000,000 and the annual outlay of salary and current expenses, to which figures I have no access. I do not have figures for the gross additions for the entire M. E. Church, but the minutes of The Central Pennsylvania Conference, which may reflect pretty accurately the numbers of the entire Church, show an average annual addition of nine members for each congregation.

The Methodist Church, along with her sister denominations, is longing and praying for an awakening that will burn out the worldliness and the love for amusement, and give God's people power in the Holy Ghost to save her own children and the world that lyeth in wickedness.

And now what shall our own dear Church of the Reformation, born amidst the greatest revival the world has ever known, and transplanted to every land by the same spirit of Pietism, what shall her record reveal?

With our vast material annually thrust upon us by immigration, unparalleled by any other denomination, amounting to a congregation of 500 daily, we should easily exceed the other churches in the number of accessions. Taking the minutes of the General Synod for 1903, we find the reports of the churches for 1902. They show an average addition by adult baptism, which are the only figures that show actual gains from the world, of 21-16 additions for each congregation in the General Synod. Adding the confirmations, we have an average of 858 to the congregation. By adding the gains by baptism, con-

firmation, certificate and restoration, we have a grand total of 20,844; but after deducting the losses by death, certificate and the sadly significant column of "other losses," we have a net gain of only 6,094, or an average net gain for each congregation of  $3\frac{3}{4}$  members for an entire year of service. Our material to secure this meagre result is indicated in the column of baptized but unconfirmed members, which numbers 46,605, and the column of catechumens of over 30,000. The expenditure to produce these additions is church property valued at nearly  $13\frac{1}{2}$  millions and an annual expenditure of over  $1\frac{1}{2}$  millions. The same report reveals the fact that it requires seven General Synod congregations an entire year to produce one student for the ministry.

We take no pleasure in presenting these figures, which in the grand totals may bring forth resolutions of congratulation in the meeting of Synods, but when compared with the great demands before us and the great resources in our hands, the results are far from what the Master or his beloved Bride would wish.

Several things will result from a careful consideration of the conditions:—

*First.* We will look for mistakes and try to correct them. If we have lived too much on our glorious history, and quibbled too long about fine points in theology, instead of seeking to save that which is yet lost, we will reconsecrate ourselves to fulfilling the Master's command, "go preach my gospel—make disciples."

*Second.* We will organize special means to bring the gospel to bear upon the unsaved. If we cannot reach the non church goers by catechization and the regular Sunday services, we will aim to reach them in secular places and between the Sabbaths. No denomination should be so free to ignore forms and places, as the Lutheran, since her founder found it necessary to come out from the historic Church, and to defy Pope, bishops and priests in order to organize Protestantism under the banner of a pure gospel. In addition to the Synods and Presbyteries, both the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches are assembling

in special "Spiritual Conferences" to plan and organize for the wisest methods to reach the unsaved masses without the Church. Bible conferences for spiritual work and workers, and systematic organization to cover the entire denomination with evangelistic meetings in a single year are being planned.

*Third.* Set apart and recognize men whom God has specially qualified and called to be Evangelists, Eph. 4 : 11, and let them become assistants to pastors, one to a Conference or Synod, who may greatly aid the pastor in the spiritual development of his people and "add many unto the Church of such as shall be saved."

*Fourth.* Let our theological seminaries pay special attention to making their students soul-winners as well as theologians, and if need be have a lectureship or professorship in this most important direction.

*Fifth.* Let each pastor aim more and more to "do the work of an Evangelist," and to cultivate the gift of soul-winning both in the aim and nature of his preaching and in his "going about doing good."

## ARTICLE V.

## TENNYSON'S IDYLLS OF THE KING—AN APPRECIATION.

By Professor W. H. WYNN, PH.D., D.D.

The long absence of any great poet from our English Parnassus, after Tennyson, is beginning to awaken apprehension and start the inquiry as to what is wrong. There are floods of highly meritorious verse thrown upon the world, chiefly lyrical, and often we are startled by a note of extraordinary sweetness and depth, but its range is limited, and a single repetition leaves the ear weary, and disappointed, and worn. Of poetry transcendently great—world-enchanting poetry—among all the English-speaking peoples there is none, and there seems to be a like barrenness everywhere else.

O, well, you say, it is easy to throw out a random judgment like that, but what we want to know is, how this sterile condition of things was ascertained. We have had no great poet since Tennyson—how do you know? Hundreds of candidates have pushed eagerly for the vacant throne—has there been no brow worthy of the laurel wreath among them all? They are brilliant, many of them, and many of them have had an applauding retinue at their back. What distinguishing mark was it that was lacking in these, in the absence of which they could not make their claim good?

To answer this question, we must have some broadly liberal idea of what poetry is—poetry of the highest order—such as Tennyson produced. Our task is a difficult one, because we must somehow catch a sense of that subtle literary quality that made Tennyson great, the same that is the infallible token, always, that a king in the world of letters is on the throne. That secret we can feel at once, but never satisfactorily describe. It is shy of words. " 'Tis here; 'tis gone," and our "partisan" has struck through it, as through "the invulnerable air."

For example, we have often gone in exhilarating search for the secret of Burns—a pronounced secret—a note of individu-

ality so musically distinct that, for the instant, we are quite sure of our ability to impale it in words. But we soon flag. Our effort is rewarded only by the white vision of the hawthorn bloom, the gurgling of the Ayr, and the summer winds breathing in the leafy coverts where lovers are wont to stroll, and—numberless other tender things, that sing themselves out in laughter and tears—these, but no clearly defined revelation of his inimitable charm. Anyhow it makes him the peerless song-singer of all the world.

Now as to Tennyson, what can we say of his secret—a thing so elusive—so that we may be sure that he is one of those far-off peaks of song that have long levels of mediocrity stretching through the ages at their base? What is the Tennysonian note, that impalpable something of which nature is sparing even to parsimony, and which presages kindred only after a long interval of years?

Well, we must go at once to the *Idylls of the King*. These are a group of little epics wrought out on the legends of Arthur and his Round Table, each with most exquisite literary finish and power, and thrown together into a consolidated whole, lacking somewhat in epic continuity, it is true, but nevertheless, in this shape, easily taking rank with those great world-poems, of which there are evermore only too few. We do not hesitate to put Tennyson's *Idylls* on the same shelf with Homer, and Virgil, and Dante, and Milton, and even to venture the judgment that in this renowned company our Arthurian poet is the stateliest of them all.

First, the Tennysonian epic has an originality of its own. It is the business of the epic to take up legend, dead for long years, and breathe into it the breath of contemporary time. Homer in this way quickened the decadent mythology of the Greeks; Dante, the mediæval myth of hell; and Milton, the imagined lacunae of the Hebrew dream of the fall. The genius of the poet gave these myths a tongue, made them musically voluble of the absorbing social and spiritual problems of their time—and for all time, for it is the universal, always, that tunes the poet's lyre. Problems? I fear I have

used a term that is contraband on the ground on which we tread—a frigid term, and not congenial to the poet's way of getting at the heart of things, savoring too much of mathematics, and of the joiner's square and rule. Problems are for those who weigh and measure, but not for those who spread the wing aloft for realms of thought and feeling, which are far enough away from the laboratory and the shop,

In like manner it sounds harsh to say of poetry, after the somewhat pedantic phrasing of Mr. Arnold, that it is "the criticism of life." The term "criticism" grates on the poetic ear. It does not sort well with the poet's craft. It is of scholastic pedigree, and has the cold blood of logic in its veins—poor convoy, indeed, over the route of ecstasy along which the poet must travel with his vision and faculty divine. Better call the poet the interpreter of life whose function it is to brood intuitively over the deepest yearnings of the race to which he belongs and make them live in glowing verisimilitude along his mighty line.

Measured by this standard, Tennyson towers immeasurably above all the prophets of his time. The area of human interest which he covers in the *Idylls of the King* is, indeed, vast in all directions, throwing a light of extraordinary effulgence on the domestic, social, and spiritual struggles of the century in which he lived. He had the genius to make allegory subserve the ends of art as never before, and in a fashion altogether unique. I know how suspicious critics are of allegory in verse. They call it scaffolding that can never be taken down. They say of the poet, Spenser, that, in his *Faerie Queene*, he threw away the unprecedented music of his verse on the factitious behaviour of Uno and her Red-Cross Knight, adjusting her adventures, at every turn of the road, to suit the tergiversation of a religious creed. Orpheus he was, harping on the banks of deliverance, and looking backward, only to lose his nearly won prize. Even Bunyan, in the view of these critics, is entitled to a triumph in this line, only because, in his untutored simplicity, he stumbled on the literary form that is alone able to carry its weight.

But these should reflect how deeply allegory is enmeshed in the legendary material which the poet must use. Legend springs up in a soil of allegory—is, indeed, allegory of long and imaginative growth. Herein lies the distinctive superiority of the Arthurian cycle—they are an enchanting allegory of the deepest social and spiritual impulses of the middle ages just at that point when they were disembodying into our modern time. This is why the poets have turned so covetously in this direction, from Chaucer on down—Milton, himself, going so far as to make repeated soundings in the old Chronicles of Geoffrey, with a view to his projected epic, which he hoped would be of such merit as the world would not willingly let die. Malory's glowing reproduction of it fed the inspiration of Tennyson, and out of it sprang, at intervals, those inimitable *Idylls*, like *Venus* leaping, now and again, from the foam of the sea. Milton missed the opportunity which Tennyson found. Given the material, it was not in the genius of Milton to build up a fabric so cathedral-like and vast. His tones were too deep and thunderous; his robust imagination too eager for chaos and clouds. Tennyson came to his task as by "a divine thrusting on," when, one day, he touched his fingers carelessly to the chords, and saw, Apollo-like, the very stones of the walls of Camelot spring into place.

What, then, in brief, is our own estimate of these *Idylls*? They are a composite Epic memorializing the deepest yearnings of our modern time. A great volume of their inspirational insight and power they garner from the broad and liberal allegory that grows with the story, and comes floating in upon the poet while he broods and writes. We note, at once, that they all cluster around the *Holy Grail*—of which it would not be over-sanguine to say, that it is the most perfect poem in all the world. From the beautiful adolescent enthusiasm of Gareth, which drives him, while yet a boy, to Arthur's court, on up, through the knightly deeds of the Round Table when at its best, the insidious sin of Lancelot and the Queen maturing, ever and anon, with a long train of disasters ensuing for that valiant company and their king, on down, through the gather-



ing gloom, until Arthur's greatest knight and his unworthy queen have consummated their iniquity, and the pillars of the commonwealth have toppled under the treason of Modred, in "that last, dim, weird battle of the West"—throughout, evermore, Lancelot is the hero in his illicit entanglement with Guinevere, whose feet have taken hold on hell—both struggling toward release, with the awful wreck of a nation strewn in their path. Altogether, we have herein the story of the "war of sense with the soul," as it has never before been told. One rises from its repeated study with the teasing inquiry, as to why the world of letters should be so tardy in placing the wreath of laurel on the one sole brow to which it belongs.

But possibly our regrets are untimely, and we should go on hopefully with these poems, seeing their supreme epic power concentrated in the *Holy Grail*. Here we come upon the turning point of the *Idylls of the King*. Here the allegory is pitched in its highest key, in order to depict the spiritual mysticism that swept in, storm-like, on the knightly company, in fanatical ebullition, when their great chief was not there to advise. To get the measure of the poet's supreme achievement in this allegory, we must bear in mind that asceticism shaped the piety of European Christendom for five hundred years; and that there is no waste in history—no fragments of the unfolding experience of mankind that are utterly thrown away. It was a phenomenon in the religious history of the Occidental peoples, vast and imposing, this thing of asceticism, too prolonged and too significant to be overlooked in the poet's scheme of depicting faithfully "the war of sense with the soul."

We speak, now, of the intuition of the poet, not of his laying out his work as the architect would draw his plans. History records the struggles of men on their way upward from the dominion of the sense—the poet, by a leap of insight, throws into allegory all the essential phases of this struggle, and even its blind experiments, giving in an instant what the long ages dramatized in a profusion of blood and tears. Arthur and his Round Table must stand for it all—a little world

imaging within itself all that goes on in the larger world, in this prolonged war of sense with the soul.

Into that noble company sin enters, in the form of a subtle indiscretion, at first, maturing in stealth, growing bolder as the outraged conscience forfeits its delicacy, but reserving to the last, as was wisely ordered, enough sensitivity to be fuel for remorse. The Holy Grail is a picture of conscience throwing itself, in maddened vehemence, against a forlorn hope—Lancelot and his comrades in fanatical quest of the rose-red goblet, pulsing with the sacramental blood of the Saviour, to see which would pluck out the root of evil from the soul. This holy vessel "mystic, wonderful," was the palladium of the nation's hopes—the first great Christian nation in that far-off British isle of the North—hovering over their national assemblies while their pristine virtues remained, but disappearing when those virtues declined. In the course of time corruption crept in upon their counsels, and the heathen were summoned from afar to harry their fair land with fire and sword. The great Arthur rose up to hurl back the tide. One hundred and fifty knights move at his beck. They are of tried valor, and have solemnly sworn "to reverence their conscience as their king." But they sit at their council-board, with no holy vessel poised above them, in quiet benediction over the troubled air.

Arthur's plan was, to beat back the heathen, and reclaim his broken people to their ancient fealty to their Lord Christ, and, in this way of unostentatious service, merit the return of the Holy Grail. In this spirit his twelve great wars had been crowned with success. But sin crept in. There was a growing scandal at the court. The great order of the Round Table was in the grip of a moral crisis that must work its ruin speedily, and the overthrow of the state, unless some timely miracle intervene. What more natural in this sad extremity, than that highly sensitive spirits should seek to bring in the lost vision by direct wrestling with the unseen?

Men and women of exceptional temperamental susceptibility for sainthood, go into solitude, and bewail the malady of the times, and, by much austerity and spiritual self-cleansing, seek

to know for themselves, that the Holy Grail is not clean gone forever from the land. They would have the rose-red vision flash out on the horizon of their prayer—the vision so long withheld from the council-board of Arthur's knights. A woman, a nun, Sir Percivale's sister, first sees it. It comes to her in her cloister, quivering down a long beam of light, "rose-red, with beatings in it," and with a far music accompanying it, as of the silver horn of a hunter over the distant hills. Through her, Sir Galahad, the ideal knight, sees it—that one of all Arthur's goodly company who could sit down in the Siege Perilous, and run no risk. He has the Grail always with him, and, finally, Sir Percivale sees him swept in the glory of it, far out over the seas, into the sky, and down into the spiritual city, which is his home.

The report of this spreads among the knights, and the year of miracles is on. Percivale's sister has seen the Grail, why may not we? The great Arthur had gone that day to clean out a nest of rebels, and avenge a private wrong—that was his way of invoking back the Holy Grail. The remnant that staid behind had got together on a summer night, with the rumor of the nun's achievement in their ears. The great banquet is spread along the hall, and as they gather round it, they are to witness Sir Galahad sitting down in that always vacant chair, except for the occupancy of the one who is absolutely pure. But in the midst of the ceremony there is a crash as from the heavens, the ancient hall shuddering, and "a cracking and a riving of the roofs, and overhead thunder"—all the venerable pile is rolled in smoke.

Then the startled company see a strange sight—a long beam of light streaming overhead, "seven times more clear than day," and borne along it the Holy Grail, only it was covered with a luminous cloud.

We need not follow the story further than to say, that in the glory of that moment, flushed with excitement, the knights arose, one after another, in the absence of their chief, swore a precipitate vow to ride a twelve-month and a day to get full vision of the Holy Grail. It was not Arthur's way, though he

conceded the right to the nun, and Sir Galahad, and such as they.

The obvious comment on all this is, that men grow weary of the long discipline of self-renunciatory service, and go to cutting out for themselves a nearer route to the bosom of God. Miracle will carry you thither, or some divine magic striking into you from without. The necessity of waiting and warring through long years of patient and painful self-conquest—by all means get rid of that. Alas! we know how this is, even if history had not been dinning it into our ears through weary centuries of spiritual disappointment and waste. There is a steep and craggy mountain to climb, with the goal of perfection set in the far-off height of the sky—we will not trudge; we will, somehow, get wings, and sweep directly to the mark. We know how this is. Under this impulse a mood becomes talismanic, the sacramental sanctities are turned into magic, and, laying hold of these, the despairing soul makes itself believe that it has leaped into glory at a single bound.

But it is the literary quality of this remarkable poem that engages us now—not the allegory, grand as that is, in the spiritual lesson it conveys. Here, for example on the very threshold of the story, Sir Percivale has occasion to describe "that mighty hall which Merlin built for Arthur long ago." What a picture that is, and what a master-stroke of genius it was to have the supreme dream of architectural glory loom up on our vision while the interior was still ablaze with the after splendor of the Holy Grail! I know of no such triumph in the art of word-painting in all the great master pieces of ancient or modern times. As when, in the presence of some great altar-piece, showing dimly through storied windows, underneath cathedral arches, where the Infinite is almost heard to whisper in syllabled articulation from the minster-gloom, we bow our heads, and are dumb with awe—so, here, before this marvel of Merlin's magic, criticism is impertinent, and the mood of wonder all that remains. It is impossible that such a picture should ever fade from the retina of the inner eye.

Word-painting! the expression is tame. We recall with

wonder, indeed, Homer's description of the hall of Alcinous, and Virgil's exquisite picture of the palace of Dido, its long corridors and banquetting chambers all gorgeous with trappings of the cloth of gold—a dream of beauty forever. But there is something in Tennyson's hall of Arthur—a touch of word-wonder, of verse miracle, if I may invent the term, which we do not find in these others, and which is best described as old Merlin's architectural magic coined into song. Of course it is a subtle thing of vowel-manipulation, and the untraceable confluence of sound and sense, in those inner harmonies that well up in the soul of the poet as from some far off Helicon that is not of this grosser world.

And, now, we have passed the threshold, and are prepared to look more profoundly into the literary marvel of the Holy Grail. Of human destiny we know but little, beyond what is commended to us on the basis of a reasonable faith. Of human aspiration we know much. Except in extreme degeneracy, it is the normal impulse in men, everywhere, to want to move upward, to get the better of to-day in the hope of to-morrow—the to-morrow, and the to morrow, leading never at all “the way to dusty death.” Aspiration is religion at its birth. For, when hope overleaps to day, it will overleap all days, and sweep on with tireless wing to some goal of perfection, that lies above the sun and stars. That is religion. It may be a dream, but humanity everywhere persists in having its spiritual city builded in the skies, above the reach of war and waste, and the unintermitting round of toil and trouble that wearies us here.

Now, it is in this region of aspiration that the poets move. All their harps are attuned to hope. If war be the theme, it is not war for its own bloody sake—a wild delight in cities sacked, fields down-trodden by the war-horse's hoof, and everywhere garments rolled in blood—but the heroism that comes up from the carnage, with the flag still waving, and God and the native land fluttering in triumph on the breeze. Not the transitory, but the enduring; or, as the philosophers say, the passing circumstance seen in the light of eternity—this is the province of

the poet, if his singing is to have any long lease of enchantment on the minds of men. And what more enduring element is there in human nature than this unsuppressed breathing, this persistent spiritual longing for something better in the bosom of the morrow than we find in the care-worn resources of to-day?

Well, what is there in all this, that has to do with the Holy Grail? On a little reflection, we see that these Idylls, thrown together, make for us our transcendent epic of hope. In the Holy Grail there is that peculiar crisis in the spiritual history of the soul struggling toward deliverance when despair seizes the helm and false lights lure the way to disastrous expedients in which no deliverance is. Over it all hope survives—witness the tolerance of Arthur, grieving over the folly of his knights, but consenting, as he must, because at that stage of their history the dread school of disappointment was their merited due. But even here aspiration is set to a high key—aspiration in the midst of the consuming heats of fanaticisms; aspiration, when the life of the nation was in jeopardy, on the one hand, and the resources of individual loyalty and courage were so little available on the other. For this, we notice, there is a wide diversity of individual susceptibility in the oath-taking knights who go on the quest.

For example, if there is to be an ideal man, who is to have easy access to the heights of spiritual security which the Grail signifies, it must be Sir Galahad—a knight before whom all opposition goes down at a touch; who is serenely victor from the first; the counterpart of Arthur, who aims at the same goal by standing at his post and staying the pillars of the nation fast going down under a tide of evils he could not stem. But both these—Sir Galahad and Arthur—are examples of what we often see around us, men of easy self-mastery and unswerving allegiance, always, to the best they know.

With Lancelot, however, the case is otherwise. There is a deep stain on his conscience. A concealed sin is sapping the fountains of his life. Lancelot was the chief knight of the Round Table, foremost in deeds of prowess in the twelve great battles that

" — splashed and dyed  
The strong White Horse in his own heathen blood"—

nearest the person of the King, but most truant to his confidence, practically holding, meantime, his fortunes and the fate of the nation in the hollow of his hand.

But there is this to be said of Lancelot: From the first he has been a reluctant victim of his illicit passion, and has fought many fierce and agonizing battles for his conscience, leaving many scarred and furrowed records on his knightly brow. Amidst it all, his stately figure towers in manly majesty before us, and we are in danger of pitying where we ought to condemn.

It is a case of a strong and noble personality, bending before the tempest of his passion, and rebounding, as we have seen the great trees of the forest in the maddened vehemence of the wind. Alas! down in the moral center of his being he is weak, and lays hold fitfully of that which might have fortified him against the evils of the queen. And now despair is looking down upon him, as he lies in abject dust at the Syren's feet. At the time of the oath-taking in Arthur's hall the demon had fastened its malign formula on his sin-sick soul—the lying doctrine, as Arthur afterwards demonstrated, that one sin unmastered, blasts all moral faculty at its source—leaves no sound tissue on which a restorative purpose might work. In this record he has been swept into the newly-kindled infatuation for the Holy Grail, and has come back a bowed and broken man, disposed as he confessed to Arthur, to give up all hope, and let his wrecked destiny run adrift.

But now we must dismiss the allegory in so far as we may, and get hold of the extraordinary literary versatility of the poet, in depicting the contrasting experiences of his two great knights, Sir Galahad and Sir Lancelot, in their quest for the Grail.

First, the scene of the passing of Sir Galahad as witnessed by Sir Percivale—was there ever so consummate an example of the fusing, at white heat, of the sublime and beautiful, in any of the master-strokes of the great poets which our widest reading can recall? And then, it is the sublime toning down from its most awful and terrifying aspects, to the beautiful, the

finished beautiful, exquisite and cameo-like, on the distant sky. That mountain over which Sir Galahad journeys to his exit, "scarred with a hundred wintry water-courses," storm-torn and riven—the great black swamp at its base, whitened with the bleaching bones of men who have perished there, and impassable but for the causeway built by some ancient king, with its thousand piers running out into the infinite sea—we could not trust ourselves to the slightest abridgement of the poet's own handiwork, in a scene like this, had we not the end in view of witnessing the sublime and beautiful coalescing in the twinkling of an eye.

Over these long-linked bridges Sir Galahad leaps, every bridge taking fire and vanishing as he crosses it, until he is out, far out, on the widening horizon of the sea and sky. And then the heavens open, and there are thunderings "like the shoutings of all the sons of God," Sir Galahad, in the meanwhile, seeming to sail out, in a mystic boat, into the immeasurable blue. But our dull paraphrase must stop right here, lest we seem as one tracing with grimy fingers some illuminated canvas, from which the artist's unrivaled pencil has just been withdrawn. Sir Percivale goes on with his story:—

And when the heavens opened and blazed again  
Roaring, I saw him like a silver star—  
And had he set the sail, or had the boat  
Become a living creature clad with wings?  
And o'er his head the holy vessel hung  
Redder than any rose, a joy to me,  
For now I knew the veil had been withdrawn.  
Then, in a moment, when they blazed again,  
Opening, I saw the least of little stars  
Down on the waste, and straight beyond the star  
I saw the spiritual city, and all her spires  
And gateways; in glory like one pearl—  
No larger, tho' the goal of all the saints—  
Strike from the sea; and from the star there shot  
A rose-red sparkle to the city, and there  
Dwelt, and I knew it was the Holy Grail,  
Which never eyes on earth again shall see.

There are many passages in the *Idylls of the King* on which the poet's art has been as lavishly bestowed, but none in which



the Greek idea of beauty is so transcendently rendered—clean-cut and definite—but with the sea and the deep azure for material, instead of the white marble of the Pentelican hills. The marvel of it is, the picture most exquisitely fits the character portrayed—Sir Galahad dissolving away in the unveiled glory of the Holy Grail, and shooting like a star into the spiritual city—a city carven on the bosom of the illimitable sky.

But where was Lancelot—poor Lancelot—now, at this time—even whilst the apotheosis of Sir Galahad was going on? We must take Lancelot into our sympathy, as suffering with him, in this his last struggle to be free. He is clearly the hero of the *Idylls*, and his stately figure keeps company with us all through the tragic story, even where his recognizance is not visible in the onset of the tournament, or the embattled shock of heathen forces fighting to the death. He is the Ulysses of this *Iliad* of the Round Table, except that, in his final peril, unlike the Greek hero, he did not have himself tied to the mast, as again the syren's enchantment wafted to him over the seas.

We speak of Tennyson's dramatic faculty. It was limited in its range, but inside those limits it was as unique and powerful as anything the great masters have to show. Thus the towering personality of Lancelot is as vividly depicted, and held as rigidly to its histrionic identity, as is Hamlet or Othello, or any of the phenomenal characters of Shakespeare—except that the relatively quiet flow of the epic must keep the explosive energy of passion conveniently in check. From that memorable day when Arthur put down the revolting kings, on through his twelve great battles, this warrior whom he loved best was puissant by his side, and the sight we get of him, as the escort of Guinevere to the court of Camelot, is the same—in every marked lineament, the same—as when he stood with Arthur on heaps of slaughtered heathen on Badon Hill. Everywhere he is chivalrous and brave, courteous and kind, with a demeanor and presence that we discover only in the bearing of the great.

See him as he moves in Astolat, among the little company there—his face, as Elaine brooded over it whilst he sat uncon-

siously at meat—furrowed, now, with lines of agony telling of the fiercer war that was raging within. See him at the jousts. It is a mark of the poet's genius that he has given to this magnanimous spirit a kindly yearning over the fortunes of the young. He follows the novitiate in his perilous quest—hovering unseen at a distance, thrusting in for rescue only when the emergency has come, and then bearing down on the enemy with annihilating force.

But now it is a question of dramatic congruity, as to whether a character so lofty may be consistently exploited in a court scandal so low, and with such utterly ruinous consequences in its wake. A man so high-minded, so strong, so gentle, so incomparably above his fellows in physical prowess, and a type of chivalry that we may almost call divine—could he be so easily drawn aside; was it wise in the poet to drop down such nobility in so vile a pool?

Well, pool there is, and the highest nobility on our planet has been known to drop into that pool. We are having a "war of sense with the soul," and the sin of Lancelot in the high places of power, where it could veil itself from detection behind the conventional amenities and hollow chivalry of court life, nevertheless creeps like a contagion through all ranks of that knightly company, and poisons the very atmosphere in which they move. It is a subtle evil, and, after Lancelot and the Queen, what strongest nerve of virtue in Arthur's chivalrous retinue may not succumb?

Merlin, the magician, succumbed to it, that "long bearded, ancient man," the architect of Camelot, "who built the king his havens, ships, and halls," and who was privy to the mystic wisdom of the starry skies—even he gave in to the wicked blandishments of the wily Vivien, letting her have his fatal secret of "the woven paces and waving hands," when he knew that she would bind him with it in hopeless prison walls, "from which was no escape forevermore." The brave Geraint was maddened into jealousy by it over his new-made wife, lest she had caught the Queen's infection from friendship with the Queen, and had well-nigh strangled the fair dove in her nest,

but for the tragic reversal of his passion in the scortatory riot in the halls of Doorm. Sir Tristram, next to Lancelot in all that was bravest and best in battlefield and boon, trifles with it, until the sword of Mark falls with fatal precision on his devoted head. And so on—the nation's life, poisoned at its foundation by this evil, pours onward its virus in every distributing river and rill, until the fields are blasted, and the unplumed knights are wandering wildly in "a land of sand and thorns." It is a fact that, under the shadow of this evil—now that we recall it—the great empires of the ancient world passed into a permanent eclipse.

But where is Lancelot—this arch-offender, who, in the delirium of his dalliance, sees not the wild ruin his sin is making, or seeing it, is utterly powerless to lend a hand? His head is in the lap of Delilah, and he is shorn. At the time of the oath-taking in Arthur's hall, his extremity has come, and he leaps at the sacramental frenzy as a dernier hope. On their way to the farewell tourney, he rides with the Queen through the dim, rich city, with the wild wail of the populace in his ears, as foreboding the dissolution of the Round Table by the rash doings of that fatal day. Arthur has so admonished, and they too—Lancelot and the Queen—weep out their fruitless penitence there, sinning in the act—sinning while deploring the sad ruin their sin had wrought. At this point in the allegory we come upon one of the profoundest lessons in the philosophy of spiritual struggle, on which we would delight to dwell, but that we have engaged to forego the allegory to get at the metrical secret of the poet's art.

Lancelot comes back from the quest to report failure in Arthur's Hall—Arthur's Hall shattered, now, together with the dim, rich city of Camelot itself, in the violence of an unprecedented storm. Pause long, I pray you, on that wonderful scene—the straggling return of a remnant of Arthur's mighty comrades humiliated by defeat. What a change! The rich zones of allegory that mounted tier above tier on the exterior of Arthur's Hall, are torn from their fastenings, and, alas! for the omen, one golden wing from Merlin's golden statue of the King, is

half-wrenched from its socket, far up on its pinnacled height.

But the details of Lancelot's retort—what betell him in his fruitless search—what a triumph that is, in all that enters into the imaginative completeness of the poet's art—of this poet, may it please you, for none but Tennyson could have ever conjured with a wand like that. Whipt by his madness into waste places, Lancelot has been beaten down by little men, mean knights, who, often time, would have fled in terror from the shadow of his spear, and Sir Bors has seen him riding at breakneck speed through the desert toward the sea. There he throws himself into a little boat—a very feather in the tempest that was raging at that time along the dreary coast. Face downward, perhaps, he had resolved, now finally, to risk whatever fortune there might be in reserve for his frail bark on that seething sea. The great waves might wrap him round in suicidal slumber—let them come on; they could but cover up in watery oblivion the ineradicable stigma of his name and shame. But, in that case, the sea itself must become incarnadine with Lancelot's Sin.

For seven days the wind swept his little boat along the weary deep, and then fell; on the seventh night he heard the shingle grinding in the surge, and, looking up, saw the enchanted towers of Carbonek, all under the blaze of the full moon and stars—

A castle like a rock upon a rock,  
With chasm-like portals open to the sea,  
And steps that met the breaker

—another vision of architectural glory, which it were sacrilege to attempt to paraphrase. Suffice it to say, that it climbs into the very heavens, and far at the summit of it, there is a chamber of imagery, that burns with the incommunicable splendor of the Holy Grail—its home, so to speak, under surveillance of flaming cherubim, and emitting the blast of a furnace against all approach of the unworthy, and the ill-advised violence of unreasoning despair. Lancelot is brave and we applaud and pity him, as he climbs up the ten thousand steps of his *santa scala*, invited, as he conceives, by the sweet voice he hears above him, which voice is only hymning him to his defeat.

As for us, we linger always in that "sounding hall." Having come thus far with Lancelot, we are so smitten with the wonder of the scene that breaks in upon our view at this half-way landing of the sounding hall, that we are fastened to the spot and inclined to let our grieving companion climb his thousand steps alone. Through the great oriel the sea lies before us, and the full moon makes its long bridge of splendor far out to where the rim of the ocean coalesces with the sky. From our dizzy height we look down upon the planet itself lying beneath us, and discover that our tower of penitence is, also, one impregnable rampart of the everlasting hills. Sounding hall, is it, because the whisper of the subdued billows and the tamed winds is audible there, or because the eternities are breathing their inarticulate anthems from the unapproachable shrines of the Holy Grail?

In any event, we would linger and muse forever in this sounding hall—erringly, perhaps, for would that not mean that the beautiful had fatally charmed us on our way to the good; and was it not, for this reason, that the poet has left this hall vacant of all inducement to remain?—

No bench nor table, painting on the wall  
Or shield of knight—

—none the less we may tarry there long enough to press the inquiry as to whether, after Milton, we may not accept the *Idylls of the King* as the world's great epic next in the order of time.

This is a question of more than technical interest, and cannot be decided off hand by the enthusiasm of the dilettante, or the critic's caprice. It is a question of literary ethics—what is justly due this transcendent poet's posthumous rank and fame? It involves the verdict of years of consensus, after the harp that made the music lies silent and unstrung. It concerns our schools. Shall certain books lie side by side on the teacher's desk—books of the highest attainable thus far, in the world of letters, of imaginative inspiration and art, such as may be commended to students as deserving a place in the inner-

most consistory of their intellectual life? Among these, so far as the epic is concerned, counted as yet by the fingers of one hand, shall we enroll the *Idylls of the King*?

We do not forget the hesitating tone of Tennyson's contemporary time. Distinguished opinion was somewhat adverse. Conspicuously Carlyle, the literary autocrat of those times, who guarded the highways of criticism like bruin prowling at Eden's gates, professed himself greatly disappointed at the unhappy turn of Alfred's dreams. It detracts, however, from Carlyle's authority in the premises, that he is confessedly wayward in his judgments, grossly misconstruing Alfred at first, and then, on the publication of "*Ulysses*," taking it all back. "*Ulysses*" was equal to the best, and so, also, was that earliest fragment of what was afterward to be the "*Passing of Arthur*," in these self-same *Idylls of the King*. The presumption of the earliest efforts ought to have tempered the "old bear's" ferocities to a kindlier and more considerate tone.\*

Indeed, Carlyle's dictum on the *Idylls* would have no interest for us, but for the deferential repetition of it by two or three prominent literary critics of our day. With these the assumption seems to be, that when Mr. Carlyle says anything all the world must bow assent. And yet of this famous utterance in disparagement of the *Idylls*, we make bold to say, that it was made in a mood of sinister thinking, and that it would never have retained its hold on the public mind but for the striking Carlylese phrasology in which it was couched.

The facts are these: Carlyle and Emerson were having a honied correspondence with one another, of genuine friendship, indeed, but with abundant reference to their trans-oceanic publishing interests, respectively, as helping to the circulation of their own books in both worlds. There are decided evidences of self-consciousness in the letters of both these men, more especially, as was natural, in the letters of Carlyle. These cronies seem to know that they are the two foremost figures of their time. But there are other stars pressing toward the zenith, and it were scarcely human that these should not have kindled a twinkle of jealousy even in the bland visage of the

sage of Concord, most certainly under the beetling brows of the snarling cynic of Chelsea. Let us refer to Carlyle's letter to Emerson dated January 27, 1867.

The old man is bereaved and broken down, and is on a vacation in Kent, getting away, as he says, from "the intrusive babblements of London," and "disgusted with the world and its roaring nonsense"—what a mood in which to read the *Idylls of the King*—these having been but recently thrown upon the public, in their incipient form, as challenging attention to the very highest the poet could produce! About the same time Emerson had published his "English Traits," and Carlyle must have carried these two books in his satchel down to Kent—books wherewithal to soothe his solitude and sweeten his bitter hours. Hear him tell of the effort: "We read, at first, Tennyson's *Idylls*, with profound recognition of the finely elaborated execution, and, also, of the inward perfection of vacancy" (he underscores vacancy) "and, to say the truth, with considerable impatience at being treated so very like infants, though the lollipops were so superlative. We gladly changed for one Emerson's 'English Traits,' and read that with increasing and ever-increasing satisfaction every evening, thanking heaven that there were still books for grown-up people, too."

"Inward perfection of vacancy," "lollipops" for infants! think of Carlyle caricaturing the *Idylls of the King* in this way, and then ask, in all seriousness, from what portions of the *Idylls* these diminutive impressions of his may possibly have come. Vacancy! lollipops! the grim old apostle of the sovereignty of the will had a way of laughing and scolding in hyperbole, a regular Teufelsdröck guffaw, that never meant a tithe of what it seemed to mean. In this case it is pure dyspeptic raving, because, as he himself elsewhere confessed, he had a philistine aversion to verse of any kind, how much more so it the *Idylls* found him when the blue devils were on a rampage in his distracted nerves.

But we have a more charitable excuse for Mr. Carlyle. He is bluffing Tennyson while taking Emerson in his embrace. It was an epistolary by-play, confidential palaver, made up of a

double movement—depreciating the Idylls as conventional momentum for setting up the English Traits—the mere confectionary of friendship, passing freely back and forth between these two literary celebrities of their day. To take it seriously, therefore, as valid criticism on the Idylls, would be to reinforce bluster with an unaccountable audacity of literary empiricism in judging of poetic worth.

One is curious to know, however, where the leonine eye of the old philosopher may have fallen, among these prodigies of "finely elaborated execution," leading him to include them all under the stigma of "vacancy," and literary bonbons for the nursery, and not for grown up people like himself. The edition in the hands of Carlyle, at this date, contained but four of the Idylls, "Enid," "Vivien," "Elaine" and "Guinevere"—which one of these, or what demerit of all of them, could have insulted his vision with an intellectual emptiness, and a sapient childishness unendurable by him?

Was it Elaine? A girl in the flower of her maidenhood, giving away her life's love to Lancelot, who did not solicit it, and who could not reciprocate it, and, when all came to all, dying of a broken heart because of it—providing in her funeral that she should be rowed up the river to Camelot, with a letter to Lancelot in her one dead hand, and a lily in the other—buried there amid the sobbing eulogies of the great Arthur and his Knights, seeing in the event the tragedy of misplaced affection, befalling in this instance one of earth's fairest and purest, because there was no mother in Astolat to advise the unwary child—was it this inimitable story, that drew from Carlyle the coarse strictures he allowed himself to deal out on the Idylls as a whole?

We reluctantly think so, and have indulged the hint only because we can find nothing in the others, that would be likely to stir the senile revulsions of "Carlyle the aged," who has evidently forgotten that he once was young. Elaine is the one poem of all the world that most adequately fathoms the depth of woman's love, its devotion, its beauty, its sweet virginal self-abandon, at that time of its maiden-efflorescence, when the



mother's counsels were most needed to make it safe. There is a philosophic wonder in that poem, that anticipates all the flaunted discoveries of our modern psychologists, who are making much of what they call the mystery of adolescence, and are finding a sweet evangel in it that needs to be, henceforth, shielded from the bitter winds that blow untimely over this garden of God. It is all here. Taken in connection with Gareth and Lynette, we have the highest that has been said or sung, by poet, priest, or pedagogue, on youth, as it bourgeons in self-consciousness, and the high ideals of love, and aspiration, and hope, all at once blushing out into the bloom of May.

Could not Carlyle, the philosopher, see in these Idylls what Carlyle, the "incrusted," was indisposed to see? Or, had his sartorial philosophy so soured his mind, and so calloused his affections, that he had come to look upon everything tender as an unmanly compromise with things that are weak—and, so, when he came to hear Elaine, on her dying bed, counsel her sweet brothers, as to how they should dispose of her body for the funeral, found his old eyes suffusing with tears, and threw the book down, and went romping through the room, crying "lollipops," and invoking the shades of Fichte to pardon the weakness in a disciple so old? Heaven save us from a philosophy of that kind!

It is pure conjecture, of course, to lodge this accusation on Mr. Carlyle, at any point in his reading of the Idylls, and especially the story of Elaine. But he himself says that the reading of these four Idylls threw these unhappy and ungenerous epithets into his mind. There could have been no element of the puerile in Enid—not a trace of it—much less in Vivien or Guinevere. I hope we are discrediting him for his lacrymose folly over the death-bed scene of the Lily Maid of Astolat.

But, right here, we seem to have struck upon the secret of the adverse criticism so often passed upon the Idylls—Tennyson was a "Sage Poet," and had a high spiritual philosophy at the soul of all his singing—these critics will be found to be training in other schools. "Sage Poets," that is a classification of Tennyson's own, with no reference, of course, to the dis-

tinguishing characteristic of his own muse. He was talking one day of Byron, whose unique personality greatly fascinated him as a boy, but, whom in his maturer years, he could not relish—going on to say: "One must distinguish Keats, Shelly and Byron, from the great 'sage-poets of all time, who are both great thinkers and great artists, like Aeschylus, Shakespeare, Dante, and Goethe. Goethe lacked the divine intensity of Dante, but he was among the wisest of mankind, as well as a great artist."

We strongly suspect that Tennyson has given us the clue to his own ideal and poetic striving in these words—his aim, in imitation of Goethe, to make the highest spiritual philosophy of his time resonant with the epic harmony of his verse. It is not a vaunt. The poet's rank is always determined by the long years of "silence and slow time," and Tennyson, we know, paid fitting tribute to this tribunal in many ways. None the less he consciously dreamed of this—that he might rank, ultimately, by the quality of his work, with the great "sage-poets" of all time.

And it is a joy to know that this rank was awarded him by competent judges of his own day. In the last year of the poet's life, '92, himself an octogenarian with all his life-work done and awaiting "this one clear call" for him, Jowett, sitting with him and other friends in his sick chamber, made this remark: "Your poetry has an element of philosophy in it, more to be considered than any regular philosophy in England." In connection with this a similar observation is attributed to Mr. Gladstone, two years after the poet's death, in a letter to his son: "I have a great conception of your father as a philosopher. The sage of Chelsea, a genius, too, was small in comparison with him."

These are memorable estimates, and valuable, as discovering, without intent, the "sage" element in the great poet's renown—giving him rank in his own calendar, with Aeschylus, Shakespeare, Dante and Goethe—and setting a trade-mark on the light-minded innuendo of the sage of Chelsea.

But, meantime, where is Milton, our one great epic poet, who

for long years has shone like a star, apart—a solitary star, on that peak of our English Parnassus that reaches deepest into the sky? May Tennyson aspire to rank with him? Yea! we will venture this, with, however, a necessary distinction in kind. Possibly Tennyson may have something to say in his own behalf, as indicating modestly where, in such august presence, he might be entitled to stand.

Milton, "inventor of harmonies," "God-gifted, organ voice of England," "a name to resound for ages"—so sings Tennyson in his incomparable ode to the blind old bard of *Paradise Lost*. This ode has more than eulogy in it. It reveals a secret—something it behooves us to know in the maker of the ode. It points out, all unconsciously, no doubt, where, in the multitudinous resources of the elder poet, the genius of the younger poet would instinctively choose to detain. There were "Titan angels" at war in heaven, the roar of their onset—the whole empyrean rocking with the thunder of their brilliant forces—it was the sublime, the Miltonic sublime, clothing itself with the tumultuous fascination of earthquake and storm.

Tennyson's poetic affinities do not run that way. The ode is a confession to that effect:

"Me, rather all that bowery loneliness,  
The brooks of Eden mazily murmuring,  
And bloom profuse of cedar arches,  
Charm—"

giving us to know, in no way of obtrusive egotism, that he is conscious of his own *peculium*, of the particular in which the trend of his art must be away from the Miltonic standard in the *Paradise Lost*. In that great poem he found storm and calm alternating, chaos rolling in thunderous masses round the creative pathway of the Almighty, and anon a world of exquisite beauty swung out in glory from the rim of the abyss. In both these realms the genius of the great master was equally at home—unapproachably so in the onomatopoetic roll of his verse, when cosmic convulsions were to be described, and the rush of demoniacal defiance would come out in organized revolt. If the epic included these both, with the preponderance of one

or other of the elements, or even with both in balancing equipoise, Tennyson could have no claim.

Let us try to conceive what was in Tennyson's mind when he drew out the memorable Ode—an ode of personal contrast, as it undoubtedly is. We recall Satan hovering at Hell-Gate, on the brink of that awful chaos which he is destined to traverse. He is to find the new world, the award of victory to the conquering Son of God, and his pathway lies through wild and billowy expanses of confusion and darkness, where the untamed elements are forever at war. The councils of the Inferno have commissioned him to carry their hell-blight to that latest creative product of the divine hand, that they may have a measure of revenge for the humiliation of their inglorious defeat—gratified malice, which will be some comfort in hell.

What a scene that is! The conception itself is on a scale of inconceivable vastness and one wonders how it could ever have taken shape, "if shape it might be called," to the extent of yielding itself in any way whatever to the subtlest power of the poet to put it in words. It is not extravagant to say, that Milton, in describing Satan's flight over chaos, exhausted the resources of our language for the sublime, and put in challenge every other language to do the same. It gives a vivid idea of the literary profusion of the mother tongue.

But what a change! When chaos is passed, and the fiend has escaped the vigilance of Uriel, a panorama of sidereal and terrestrial splendors opens out, such as must test the subtlest powers of the imagination to conceive and express. There is to be provided an easy transition from darkness to light, from the fuliginous tumult and mad confusion of the abyss out of which Satan has emerged, to the incomparable glories of sunlight and calm. Satan's eye catches a view of all this splendor lying below him, from the dizzy peak of an Assyrian mount. Paradise and all the stretch of Eden sweeps in billowy verdure before him. Imagine the scene. What there is there of river and grove, of orchard and meadow, of genial sunshine and restful shade, of pastoral quiet on a thousand slopes, birds of all plumes, herds and flocks feeding at will on all the grassy plains

flowers and fragrance, the very winds languishing with the burden of their sweets—all this the poet must adequately picture, and, for the purpose, he must find in his vocabulary a new armory of words. Milton has done it—suffice to say—with Virgilian realism and finish, rivalling his great model in the deftness of his touch, and prompting us to say, when turning away from the vision, it can never be done again.

Now it was on this side of the Miltonic debenture that Tennyson's balance was cast. Here was the "bowery loneliness" he coveted, the "brooks mazily murmuring," the "bloom profuse of cedar arches." Immediately we recall certain inimitable similes, scattered here and there over the *Idylls*, that must have floated into the mind of the poet as exhalations from this scene in Eden, when his own unique aptitude in this line was at its happiest, but with a fineness and delicacy of coloring which Milton never reached.

But who is authorized to say that Milton had a monopoly of the sublime? Often we hear the random talk of the critics running on in this way. The epic should always show an easy mastery of the sublime—as Homer and Virgil, for example, in their episodes of adventure into the shadowy world. Milton's *Paradise Lost* is, three-fourths of it, occupied with that shadowy, extra mundane world, and the unquestioned preëminence of the sublime, in all that masterly scope, has set the type—inexorable and exacting—for all those who would aspire to excellence in that line. Turning to Tennyson, these critics say, they look in vain for the sublime. It is all beautiful, indeed, elaborately and exquisitely so, for the most part, but the sublime, the catch-word of the epic, they do not find. There is none of that overpowering vastness, the roar and riot of circumstance, the throes of herculean endeavor, that go to make for us our emotion of the sublime.

Halt a little. Is that not a rash judgment, wildly missing the mark? Let us go back to the *Idylls of the King*. Reading there—deep—let us discriminate. There is a tumultuous sublime, and one that soars like the eagle on motionless wing. There is a supernatural sublime, and therein, indeed, is Milton

to be crowned always as the artist-in-chief. But for the sublime, in close contact with the high ethical training of our human estate, where hope and despair, triumph and defeat, alternate and commingle to bring out the full measure of the man—what we may call the moral sublime—there is, indeed, a great wealth of this in the *Idylls of the King*.

For example—well, the examples are everywhere—but let us take Arthur on Badon Hill, as described by Lancelot; or Lancelot himself on Carbonek; or the flight of Sir Galahad; or the great King taking leave of his recreant Queen, with the plumed "Dragon of the great Pendragon" swathed round with "moony vapor," as he moves ghost-like from Almesbury to the last great battle of the West; or, the storm in Vivien, signaling the overthrow of Merlin by a charm of his own devising—and so, on and on, a tacit sublimity, caught most impressively by the aid of the allegory, and the high spiritual philosophy that inspires it all. In face of all this, what becomes of the disparaging praise of Tennyson, that he is an incomparable master of form, but is empty of that larger substance which the form implies? It is the old Carlylean innuendo of "finely elaborated execution," with a corresponding vacancy of a full-tide inspiration and volume underneath.

It is all wrong. Those who make it, unwittingly betray their incapacity to enter, sympathetically, into the aims of the poet, and justify the suspicion that they have not studied the *Idylls*, under the far reaching illumination of the allegory—which they have unwisely prejudged—or under any system of critical discrimination worthy to be named. The belittling contrast with Milton has but the one flimsy pretext to back it—the alleged lack of continuity that marks the *Idylls*, and this we can show, is more than compensated by the ethical solidarity underlying the whole. The *Idylls*, says Tennyson, are "the dream of a man coming into practical life, and ruined by one sin"—a moral tragedy, therefore, running like a scarlet thread through every diversity of experience, good and bad, which awaits the life of such a man. They are a series of stories that write out, in allegorical vividness, the eternal pre-

rogatives of the conscience, and the devouring Eumenides that pursue the guilty rebel to his doom.

The *Paradise Lost* has, indeed, the same theme, and the judgment-dealing drama is enacted therein, on a stupendous scale. But the drama is unreal, and comes off in a realm of heroic effort that has no philosophic net-work of interest with human life, as we find it—only a theological, or mythological link of sequence, that was destined in a few years to be broken down. Milton was not a sage-poet. He took Christian mythology as he found it, and worked it into the glowing axles of his chariot, like the burnished wheels in Ezekiel's vision, rising and falling as the spirit within gave impulse, but not having the whole circuit of human interest within which to move.

Clearly the *Idylls* have a two-fold advantage over the *Paradise Lost*. They have a high intuitive philosophy that is proximately final, as respects the spiritual cravings of men; and they exhibit a unique power over words, and the subtle symbolism of emotion, that has no rival in all the great masterpieces of ancient or modern times. And then the peculiar flavor of the Tennysonian blank verse, or shall we call it music—in any event, as remarkable, in its kind, as is that of the *Paradise Lost* indeed an advance on this, as it was, on the halting rhythm of those going before. In the presence of all this we confess to a feeling of awe. It is the unceasing marvel of the genius of the poet that words, and the harmony of vowel sounds, should be so completely plastic to his touch, somewhat as we may conceive Apollo improvising divinely on the strings of the harp. As we dwell on it the mystery grows. We hear strains, and cadences, and musical modulations we never heard before, and back of it all, we become aware of the larger mystery of the unique personality of the poet, which gives to every note in this music, a strange spiritual effluence that we know not how to describe.

## ARTICLE VI.

THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF  
A GRADUATE STUDENT.

By J. D. RODEFFER, Ph.D.

Exceedingly opportune are the recent articles on educational subjects that have been published by distinguished educators in the Lutheran Church.\* Although Dr. Richard admits that most of those that appear in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY were solicited, yet the earnestness and spontaneity of utterance that characterize them indicate that the need for expression had already been felt. If with no other result than to make the view more nearly panoramic, I should like to contribute something towards the discussion of this many-sided question that is inseparably connected with the welfare of our Church.

In the articles referred to, the chief problems that confront denominational colleges, and more particularly Lutheran colleges, have been stated from the viewpoint of the college president or the college professor. It is my wish to draw the attention of those interested in higher education in the Lutheran Church, to the consideration of still another phase—the college course as viewed by a university man. That such a theme deserves discussion is shown by the fact that our college graduates are availing themselves of university facilities in increasing numbers, and that any college that does not urge

\* *The Church and Education*, by J. Howard Stough, Ph.D.; THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, XXXIV, 110-129; *The Mission of the College*, by John A. Himes, Litt.D.—*ibid.*, 182-192; *Some Present Needs in Educational Work*, by Charles G. Heckert, D.D.—*ibid.*, 193-201; *The Problem of the Lutheran Church in Higher Education*, by Frederick L. Sigmund, D.D.—*ibid.*, 202-218; *The Education Required by the Times*, by E. B. Knerr, Sc.D.—*ibid.*, 218-237; *Specialization and Concentration in Education*, by J. W. Richard, D.D., LL.D.—*ibid.*, 237-242; *The Object and Method of Christian Collegiate Education*, by James A. B. Scherer, Ph.D.—*ibid.*, 352-362; *The Mission of the Christian College*, by J. A. Morehead, D.D.; *The Roanoke Collegian*, vol. 30, pp. 99-104.



its best graduates to go on into higher fields of study is laying itself open to the charge of being provincial. That no college can long flourish when this accusation against it is justly made and is confirmed by public opinion, is becoming self-evident.

On all sides there is manifest a tendency to regard the old college course as antiquated and to substitute in its place a new curriculum that shall "measure up more fully to the standard of the times." To one the chief *desideratum* is to offer more electives; to another our great need is to strengthen our courses in physical science; while to a third it is imperative that we should have more manual training.

Now I submit to the thoughtful student that owing to the lack of definition there is here a confusion bordering on chaos. It is evident that to the first the term "college" is nearly synonymous with university, whereas to the last it scarcely means as much as a good high-school. That we should have manual training is granted, but not that we should have it in our colleges. Its place is in the grades and possibly in the lowest year of the high-school. Technical schools are here not in point.

The cry of specialization has led even the conservative to advocate that we yield to the popular demand for more elective courses. The college, it is claimed, has to compete not only with State institutions, but also with professional schools, and it is impossible to hold students through the junior and senior years unless the demand for elective courses be met. It will be observed that this claim is founded in a condition, and that as conditions change, the weight supporting the argument also varies. Fifteen years ago there were comparatively few professional schools that required a college degree for admission; now they are numerous. The signs indicate the approach of the time when no professional school of recognized standing will venture to dispense with this condition. Witness the fight that has been going on in the American Medical Association.

But the popular demand in the present is to the minds of many a stronger argument than the probable conditions in the future. Does a popular demand always have to be met?

There is a popular demand that the standard for admission to the college be lowered. Are we going to yield to it? There is a popular demand that colleges grant the Ph.D. degree. Are we going to supply that demand? Popular demand in itself is not a valid argument unless it be the recognized function of the college to meet that particular want.

Now let us come down to fundamental principles. It is possible for a father to let his child specialize from his infancy to the end of his course of education, but obviously no sane man will allow it. It is universally recognized that a broad foundation should be laid before the process of specialization be attempted. Herein lies the *raison d'être* of the college course. For the college to yield too much to the cry for electives is to cut away the ground under its own foundations.

But it would be well to inquire whether the term "specialization" is being uniformly used. Is it not possible that this word, like the term "college," connotes a different concept according to the geographic location of the person using it? Is it not also possible that this word, like the phrase "research-work," has, from subconscious presumptuousness, been sadly misused? It is profitless now to turn aside to inquire into our looseness of speech and our corresponding looseness of thought. Let it suffice to give a definition of specialization laid down by one of our most famous specialists. I put it concretely. The most successful specialist is the man who can bring from the most remote fields the greatest number of seemingly unrelated facts to bear upon a particular department of investigation. It is necessary for the specialist to have a comprehensive outlook over departments related to his own, if for no other reason than to obtain a proper perspective.

The time-honored illustration of the German professor who, at the close of his career, regretted that his life-work had not been confined to the Greek dative case, is to many persons an instance of extreme specialization. But to master the dative case demanded a thorough understanding of every other case, the usage of which bordered on that of the dative. Historical grammar required that the origin of case, as a problem in itself, be investigated, and how it came about that the Greek

and the Latin no longer possess as many cases as the Sanskrit. The investigation must also be applied to modern analytic as well as synthetic languages in order that the reason for the loss of the dative be ascertained. So just one vital point of language leads the investigator into a consideration of the usages of all languages before he can speak with authority on his chosen subject.

During the winter semester of 1900-1901 a professor at the University of Berlin delivered a course of lectures on the year 1866 in German history. This again looked like extreme specialization, but the professor wove into his lectures all the main threads of modern European history since the downfall of Napoleon.

If university professors recognize the need of a broad foundation of studies, it is not for the college professor to say "This is an age of specialization," and proceed forthwith to encourage the immature student to take elective courses. A famous professor of chemistry used to say: "If you want to learn chemistry, first study Greek;" yet what subjects appear more unrelated than these?

The weakest point in our curricula is, as Dr. Heckert maintains, our courses in physical science. The reason for this is not far to seek. The expensive equipment requisite for modern laboratories in chemistry, physics and biology has been beyond the reach of the slender resources at the disposal of our college presidents. So long as our colleges have uncertain financial support, so long will this very just demand of the age have to go unsupplied, with the result that many of our best students will continue to find themselves forced to enter the over-crowded class-rooms of State institutions.

But let us return to our starting-point. I have said above that the *raison d'être* of the college course lies in the demand for a broad foundation of studies. In its own chosen field, the most serious competitors of the denominational college are the State institutions and the great, endowed universities, the professional schools no longer requiring consideration.

Not including denominational loyalty, the two chief factors that enter into this competition are expense and thoroughness

of instruction, with an increasing tendency, as the wealth of the country is developed, towards the predominance of the latter. On the ground of expense, it will be generally admitted, I think, that the State institutions that offer free tuition and scholarships are our most formidable rivals in college work. But in thoroughness of instruction it is the college departments of the great universities that have been setting the standard for all college work. If our denominational colleges hope to maintain themselves in the future, they will have to permit themselves to be measured by this standard. The moment there is an admission of two standards—the one for the college department of a great university, the other for denominational colleges—from that moment, because of an unfaltering determination on the part of young Americans to secure the best in education, our denominational colleges are doomed. They may continue for years, depending on a certain amount of ignorance among their constituencies to keep up their number of students; but in proportion as knowledge of educational facilities is disseminated among the masses, and as competition becomes more intense, to that extent will the law of the survival of the fittest gradually bring about the extinction of the denominational college.

Now in considering this development along the lines of natural evolution, I have purposely left denominational loyalty out of the discussion. There is a probability of its having a retarding effect in this evolution, but that denominational loyalty alone will support an institution for a long period in the face of keen competition, is not to be believed. Nor should we as Lutherans expect it. The traditions of our Church in the Fatherland have not been thus. An institution, even a denominational institution, should be so strong intellectually that an appeal on the ground of denominational loyalty should rarely be needed. With all respect to the gentlemen whose articles have been referred to, it is reasonably clear that an excessive use of this term in appealing for students is a sign of weakness.

It seems to me furthermore that in the question of a standard of entrance requirements there is a confusion caused by

lack of uniformity among institutions which have no other affiliation than that of geographical location. Colleges of other denominations as well as our own, universities that scarcely do the work of a second-class college, State institutions of uncertain grade, and the large, endowed universities are all offering college courses with varying requirements for admission and advancement and still more varied results attending their standard of graduation. In the midst of this chaos it would be strange if we could not get a gleam of hope and promise for our Lutheran colleges. Such a gleam has been caught in Kansas. The author of *The Church and Education*, who draws an admirable distinction between education and training, has fixed his eyes on the State institutions in Kansas and finding there inefficient work, says: "For a careful comparison will show that outside of the professional lines they offer practically the same work that we are doing in the denominational schools, with this difference possibly, that we are doing it *a little better* than the State." It is to be regretted that he did not support this conclusion by other arguments than a comparison drawn from the State oratorical contests, for in the East such contests are notorious for not being a fair test of scholarship.

The confusion growing out of the lack of uniform requirements and the rush to secure students cause the standard for admission and for graduation to be lowered. This is how the situation appeals to the author of *The Mission of the College*.

"The higher education has not progressed in proportion to the numbers enrolled in our universities and colleges. The requirements have fallen, in rigidity if not in quantity, both for entrance and for advancement, and names are found on the registers of many institutions which could hardly have got there by any test of scholarship."

Dr. Himes does not specify the class of institutions to which he refers, but it may safely be contended that this accusation is a just one when applied to all of the classes mentioned above, with the exception of the great universities. By these I refer to such institutions as the Johns Hopkins, that has never joined in the undignified rush for students; Harvard and Col-

umbia, that have never lowered their standard of admission, however great the popular clamor.

Paradoxical though it may seem, the universities are in fact indirectly supporting the denominational colleges by insisting that a high standard be maintained. That the requirements, both for entrance and for advancement, have fallen in rigidity is one reason why a new competitor with the denominational college has steadily been gaining ground. This is the high-school. While it is true that the better high-schools have been advancing towards the college plane, it is likewise true that, as Dr. Himes maintains, the requirements of our colleges have fallen and they have consequently been gravitating toward the level of the high-school. There are many instances of high-school graduates entering the sophomore and even the junior year of our colleges, whereas in the case of the great universities, they are fortunate if they succeed in entering the first year of the college department.

Why should not our colleges do real college work? There is not a Lutheran college with which I am acquainted that prepares a student adequately for the postgraduate department of the Johns Hopkins University. But to be fair to our colleges, the same statement can also be made of nearly all the other denominational colleges throughout the country and of many State institutions. Wherein does the trouble consist? 1. Lack of thoroughness in essential studies. 2. Failure on the part of many colleges to provide instruction in branches indispensable to successful university work.

Just one illustration with regard to the latter. The student who cannot read German and French without recourse to dictionaries and grammars is not fitted for any department of the Johns Hopkins, not even the Medical School; and yet some denominational colleges offer one year as the whole course in French—hardly enough to cause the French course to seem more than a dream to the student one year after he graduates. Our better colleges offer three years in both German and French, but what student, not of German parentage, can at the end of that time read German at sight? I lay stress on these facts because it is my observation and the testimony of many

of my friends that a year is lost at the Johns Hopkins University more frequently from inadequate preparation in modern languages than from any other single cause. How sadly is the student handicapped if he goes abroad for study.

Lack of thoroughness in essential branches is also responsible for inadequate preparation for a university course. Years ago Harvard College led the way in developing the modern college method of teaching English composition and rhetoric. This was immediately taken up by the college departments of the other leading universities and more recently even by the better high-schools; but as yet the Harvard method does not obtain in our Lutheran colleges. It is because of facts such as these that the instructors of the graduate students in high-grade universities are often forced tacitly to make a distinction between students who come from the college department of their own university or others of a similar grade and those who come from denominational colleges and many State institutions. That is why at Harvard University, the Harvard bachelor of arts has exceptional prestige. As a rule his equipment is better.

Since our Lutheran colleges have not been doing college work, measured by university standards, it does not seem reasonable that they should undertake to do university work. That institutions of really the same grade as the better academies should ever have undertaken to confer the Ph.D. degree—that degree which by sacred right, born of the long-established usages of conservative scholarship, was peculiar to the highest universities—will stand forever as a monument to the chaotic conditions that have characterized the history of American education. In an article on "The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the United States," (*Columbia University Quarterly*, VI, 255), Professor E. D. Perry says:—

"Within twenty years from the first award of the (Ph.D.) degree at Yale the American Philological Association found it necessary to protest emphatically against the abuse, and the Federation of Graduate Clubs in 1896 uttered a dignified but forcible denunciation of such prostitution of the degree, while for years past the *Educational Review* has carried on a vig-

orous campaign against the practice, mercilessly exposing the bare-faced offers made by some obscure institutions to enroll persons on their 'Alumni list,' with the rank of Ph.D., for a moderate consideration only." Although Professor Perry expresses himself thus vigorously against granting the honorary Ph.D., he makes clear the fact that many institutions claiming to confer it on examination are often really deluding themselves into thinking that they are performing a meritorious service. It is doubtless, too, a service for which there is a popular demand! Hear him further:—

"The worst offenders have been the smaller denominational colleges in the West and Southwest \* \* \* Many of the institutions which claim to award the degree for work actually performed, advertise conditions so absurdly lax that the degree is in fact no better than an honorary or rather a gratuitous one. One institution, which grants it for a very moderate amount of rather elementary reading done *in absentia* (terms on application) makes the requirement that the examination to be taken must be held 'in the presence of a clergyman.'"

It does seem illogical, and even absurd, that certain western and southwestern schools should persist in awarding Ph.D.'s for work that at Columbia would not win an A.B. This is why there has been virtually forced on American professors who have won the doctorate a custom which to the eyes of Europeans appears ridiculous—that of indicating in parenthesis after the professor's name the institution which conferred the degree. Anarchy is a state dreaded by us all, yet, in the original sense of the word, we have placidly and even complacently allowed ourselves to come nearer to anarchy in education than in any other great phase of our civilization.

I do not believe, though, that the awarding the Ph.D. degree was ever normally developed by our Lutheran colleges. I believe that it was forced on them by schools of other denominations. At least upon those who hold otherwise rests the burden of proof to show why Lutheran institutions in America should ever have taken this radical and unwarrantable departure from the usage of the educational institutions in Germany.



But fortunately the college-conferred Ph.D., whether honorary or given after examination, will soon be a thing of the past. To secure this, if for no other reason, would justify the formation of the Association of American Universities, which has waged steady and successful war on the conferment of this degree by institutions other than accredited universities.

There is another respect in which it is doubtful whether all of our Lutheran colleges have been doing their full duty. In some there has been a failure on the part of the faculty to urge the most promising students to pursue advanced courses in the university. As a result, too many of our students look upon securing their college diploma as the final step in their educational career. Recently some of our institutions have established courses leading to the A.M. degree, usually with one year of resident study; but even this plan, commendable in and by itself, is of doubtful expediency if students fall into the habit of looking upon this course as a substitute for a course in a university. "That college," said a Western man to a college president, "that college did all it could to keep me from getting an education."

Nothing is of such aid to a college in maintaining its standard in the face of popular clamor for low entrance requirements as keeping in close contact with the great universities by sending a constant stream of students into their lecture-rooms. The time is past when the college can be a little world in itself, holding aloof from the great currents of thought. Nor should a college make the kindred mistake of taking "the rustic murmur of its bourg for the great wave that echoes round the world."

Some of our best colleges are recognizing the necessity of securing university men for instructors. In a preceding number of *THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY* the point has been sustained that Lutheran laymen trained in the universities make just as capable instructors as clergymen. And why not? One would hardly expect to find in the Lutheran Church strenuous advocacy of only ministers for college professors. It is rather an English than a German custom. To-day in the country districts of Germany it is the schoolmaster who conducts ser-

vice in the absence of the pastor. At the present time college instruction by the clergy finds its most complete logical development in America in the practices of the Roman Catholic Church.

But the citing of analogy is usually without value unless the measure advocated is approved by practical judgment. On *a priori* principles, which is more likely to recognize and establish a high standard of college work, the man trained in the theological seminary or the one trained in the university? "Probably one of the things absolutely necessary is for all our colleges to catch more of the modern spirit of education," writes Dr. Heckert. In no other way can this modern spirit be more speedily and effectually caught than by securing university men as teachers; and Dr. Heckert, with wise foresight, is putting his theory into practice. Of the same tenor are the words of Dr. Morehead who, speaking of his predecessor, says: "It is already sufficiently patent to those who have known his work, that Dr. Dreher's distinctive contribution was the development of the efficiency of the college as a teaching force. The gradual installation of a well-equipped faculty, the provision of library and other facilities, and the introduction of modern methods of teaching are the achievements which have marked the progress of the institution to its present honorable position. Consequently, there is scarcely need of the assertion that the future policy of Roanoke College will embrace the purpose of attaining in ever increasing measure complete efficiency as an educating force."

The more conservative element in our Church fear that the moral atmosphere supposed to pervade the life of a denominational institution will not be conserved unless the professors are clergymen. The necessity of conserving this moral atmosphere is in itself an argument of the first importance. Reverence for things sacred, which should be the habitual attitude of students in all Lutheran schools, is one of the main foundation-stones on which the denominational college is based. But university men who will foster and cherish this spirit can easily be found, and educational economy in the highest sense demands that they be secured.

A matter of deep concern to all interested in higher education is found in the illuminating article of Dr. Sigmund. He informs us that among forty Lutheran institutions, "bearing the name of college or university and offering courses in rank above those of secondary schools," twenty-five report fewer than ten instructors, and that "twenty schools fall below an attendance of one hundred and fifty students and only ten have a total attendance of two hundred and fifty or more."

The educator will at once assent to the proposition that the importance and the influence of an institution can not be measured by the number of students on its rolls. In education quality counts for more than quantity. But yet it must be admitted that quality is often conditioned by quantity, and many of the institutions here referred to are cases in point. With so few instructors and such slender endowments, it is impossible for these schools to do good work. The income from tuition-fees is small. Gifts from private benefactors are uncertain. The probability is that the State institutions will drive them out of existence unless they sacrifice local pride and a good deal of tender sentiment for the common good, and combine with stronger schools. This is the measure advocated by Dr. Richard and from almost every viewpoint that has an outlook on the future it is the only solution of the problem. Few will gainsay that it is better for a weak college to merge with a stronger or a more favorably situated institution and to devote its energies and resources to the building-up of the latter than for it to be forced eventually to close its doors on account of State competition. That such institutions by persisting in doing inferior work are morally reprehensible, the previous part of this article has attempted to show.

The discussion of the college course in its relation to the university would be incomplete without reference to the probable development of the latter. At the present time our conception of the richly endowed university is that of an institution which expends annually a sum approximating a million dollars. That the time is not far distant when this present expenditure will seem insignificant is shown by this excerpt from an address of President Harper, of the University of Chicago, at the

celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Johns Hopkins University. I quote with comparative fullness, because President Harper also furnishes a discussion of the future of the college which may serve as a fitting conclusion for this paper.

"Up to this time, we have known what could be done by a university with an annual expenditure of one million dollars or so. In this next period, there will be institutions which will have ten millions of dollars with which to conduct a year's work. This will mean not merely growth, but in large measure, reorganization; at all events, organization on new lines.

"The new period will see still greater differentiation; the higher work of the university will be separated more clearly from the lower work of the college; many colleges will undertake to do work of a more distinctly college character than that which they are now doing; and many high-schools will rise to the dignity and grade of colleges. \* \* \*

"In the new period, the United States will receive proper recognition for university work, and, while American students, it is hoped, will always find it advantageous to visit Europe, the time is near at hand when the students of European countries will take up residence in our American universities.

"The new period will see an intermingling of university work and university ideals in all the various activities of our national life; in the business world, in the political world, and in the literary world. The old idea of separation from the world at large is fast disappearing, and the new day has already dawned, in which the university is to do notable work in fields hitherto almost unknown; and by methods hitherto almost untried."

## ARTICLE VII.

## THE YELLOW PERIL AND FOREIGN MISSIONS.

By REV. J. M. CROMER, A.M.

Few themes have furnished so much food for speculation as the probable outcome of the war between Japan and Russia. This is owing, largely, to the probable success of Japan, this being a people belonging to the yellow race, and also heathen.

The writers upon the subject are for the greater part European, and their views of the final results are exceedingly pessimistic, if not alarming.

But so far as we have read there does not seem to have been any very profound study of the question, and no one has looked at the matter from the higher ground of Christian Civilization.

One writer alone of those whom we have read has made any special departure from the prevailing European sentiment. The editor of the *Varia*, an illustrated monthly published in Stockholm, ventures to say that "the powers that desire the advance of culture, liberty and progress, as England and America, sympathize with Japan, while the nations that stand for militarism, despotism and the repression of the rights and privileges of the masses, are hoping for the success of Russia." But this article is considered "bold" and "unusual." It is certainly in strange contrast with the sentiment from that quarter of the world, and is made more so from the fact that, coming from a country where Christianity is the state religion, it allies the two leading Christian nations of the world with the heathen Japan, and allies other nations not so pronounced in matters of religion with so-called Christian Russia.

Only the gravest peril is seen in the victory of Japan. Dependencies and colonies of European powers are then expected to throw off their allegiance to ruling governments and declare their independence. The doors of commerce in the Orient, it is claimed, will be closed against the civilized world. Prohibi-

tive tariffs will be laid upon foreign goods. The white man, the world's master, is not only to be driven from Asia, but from Europe and America, if not from off the face of the earth. In short, the "Yellow Peril" is the white man's extinction.

Let us look at this subject from the standpoint of Christian Civilization. Speculation is unavoidable also in this view. But the facts as we see them make our conclusions far more probable.

We need only suggest the spirit of progress which has reigned throughout the greater part of the world for the last half century. Nor can we overlook the part which war has played in that progress. For while war is destructive of life and property and has the immediate effect of lowering the morals of the nation involved, it has, notwithstanding these facts, been the forerunner of better things. New impetus is given to all forms of industry. Conceptions of the country's possibilities are enlarged. Higher ideals are formed, and even the nobler qualities of character are developed.

The United States entered upon an entirely new era of progress after the civil war. Both Spain and the United States have made tremendous progress since their war. The benefits have accrued to the conquered as well as the conqueror. And we see no reason why this order may not obtain in the present conflict. Indeed, such seem the possibilities of the outcome of the present war that the whole civilized world must be greatly benefited. For in this day of rapid transit and growing productivity, the benefit of one nation is in a measure the benefit of all. We believe this principle will be exemplified in the present conflict in a degree and upon a scale hitherto unknown.

It has been misleading that in this war Christianity has been said to be in conflict with heathenism, and that justice and right were necessarily with Russia, the so-called Christian nation, and that civilization at large depended upon the success of her arms. It is true that Russia is nominally Christian. And it is true that Japan is nominally heathen. But while Russia has her Christian creed, and her strongly organized State Church, and her extended forms of religion, it is just as true that Japan has in large measure incorporated the spirit

and ideas of Christian civilization. While it may be truly said of Japan that her civilization is imitative and not a native product, it may also be said of Russia that her religion is one of outward form and ceremony, and in this respect is also imitative.

As we see it, the forms of religion are with the Russians in their recognition of Christianity, while the fruits of Christianity are in no small measure with the Japanese in their advanced civilization.

We do not mean of course that religion enters at all into the cause of this conflict or that it will necessarily affect the terms of final agreement. But while Russian success would not advance her form of religion and is not intended to do so, our contention is, Japanese success would greatly enhance civilization, which in its accepted form is the legitimate fruitage of Christianity. And in the advance of civilization Japan must certainly take on a newer and better life, and Russia must be benefited in spite of herself, and the whole world helped forward.

It might require a more subtle philosophy than we could comprehend to show how it might be possible for the true spirit of Christianity to be more manifest in civilization than in a mere profession of her dogmas. But if, as the great Teacher said, we are to be known by our fruits, it would not be unscriptural to recognize the Christian elements in civilization. And when we come to a closer study of the Japanese we cannot fail to find these elements. They are progressive, they are eager for advancement in all that makes a nation great in this day when Christian nations are the standard. Russian soldiers who have been prisoners of the Japanese testify fulsomely of the uniformly kind and humane treatment they received from their heathen foe. The Japanese have for years been students of and in England and America. And they have imbibed far more than they can realize of the Christian spirit and temper of these Christian countries.

So much can not be said of Russia even though called a Christian nation. There is much reason why the more advanced Christian nations sympathize with Japan. This sympathy has been spontaneous, arising from no special pleading, but out of the common sentiment of these nations, and has its cause

in an affinity of spirit which defies analysis. But the root of it is in a more essential exemplification of the better things Christianity develops in the heart and life.

Russia has been the aggressor, persistently encroaching upon Japan's surroundings. She has been obstinate in international conference, and has consequently strained the terms of international agreement. Her whole aim and policy has been to benefit herself at any cost within the limits of international agreement. No one believes that Russia seeks the conquest of Korean territory for any good she may do that territory. The prime motive is to enlarge Russia by decreasing other nations.

With these thoughts we go back now to the late "Boxer uprising" in China. The one thing which surprised the Christian world in the revelations of this movement was the very little progress made in the Christianization of China by our missionaries. Such was the disappointment that a great cry was raised against Foreign Missions, threatening no little harm to this strong arm of Christian evangelization.

Reasons for this fact were found in the antipodal racial characteristics of the Mongolian and Caucasian, and in the equally different character of their respective religions, Confucianism and Christianity. Added to these was a third, found in the inherent suspicion which the Chinese had for the motives of our missionaries, and which the conduct of some of them did not help to remove, and we have at least a partial explanation for the meagre results of Christian Missions in China. But a deeper study will suggest that possibly new methods of teaching these heathen our religion must be adopted.

We have just seen how much of Christianity the Japanese have really absorbed in their own way, and it seems all the greater in contrast with what we have been able to introduce into China in the old way of carrying on our missions.

True, Japan has had some advantages. She is an insular nation separated from the Empire of China by the sea. But the racial characteristics are closely similar, and the progress made by the Japanese not only argues the possible progress of the Chinese, but suggests two things, that Japan is naturally



qualified to be the teacher of China, and that her method is best adapted to the Chinese mind.

This close relation has hitherto been impossible. Japan was China's conqueror, and the best of feeling did not prevail. But in the strange movement of events, Japan has now become incidentally China's protection and defense, and will doubtless become China's deliverer.

Thus old sores will not only be healed, but China will come to look with studious wonder upon her little cousin nation.

The first step in any nation's progress is in breaking away from those customs and forms and ideals by which it has been bound. To give up the old has thus far been too much for some of the oriental nations. But Japan has cut loose from her historic fastenings and has swung out into the stream of present day progress. She has made the sacrifice of her national traditions, and comes to the task of her future with open eyes and receptive mind. The rest will be easy. Already she has imported largely of western civilization. She has the happy faculty of being able both to introduce and to imitate our ideas and spirit.

With Christianity this has always been the crucial test. The Master, Himself, gave this as the cause of the rejection of His truth by the Pharisees of His time. They could not break away from their bondage to the "traditions of the elders." Their old wine-skins would not hold the new wine. There must not only be new works, but a new man to do them.

All this the Japanese have done. They gave up the old bottles and are importing the new wine. This is the most hopeful feature thus far discernable in the Mongolians.

Usually we have said Christianity and progress. For in the world-advancement thus far the "mustard-seed," the "leaven" of Christianity, has been introduced, and the slow process of natural growth and development has been depended upon for the fruition. Social, civil and commercial progress has come in time.

But there are many, even in our own land, who have been able to appreciate and enjoy the results, who have not apparently been able to understand the cause. They appreciate and

glory in civilization, but do not recognize Christianity as the cause. Some would even attempt a separation between our religion and our civilization, and make civilization a cause, a movement of its own, notwithstanding the fact that the two have always been found to co-exist, and that the religion came first.

But in our present study we must reverse the order and say progress and Christianity. This is not making the effect the cause, and *vice versa*. It is simply introducing the Christianity in the effect that it may come to be adopted as a cause. It is commending the vine by giving samples of its choicest fruit.

This is what Japan is doing and has been doing for nearly a half century. Taking things in the reverse order from the Caucasian race she reverses the order of her civilization. She can taste the fruit and know that it is good without knowing much of the vine and its culture. And thus is she to become convinced of the superior character of the vine and to be led to import it bodily, and, transplanting it into her own soil, to raise the fruit for herself. Thus no prejudice can arise, no customs or forms remain to oppose, and the spirit of progress already there will receive and nourish the new cause. The declamation will become the oration. Copyists will become composers. Imitators will originate. They will then have both the religion and its civilization, but because they first had its civilization.

This is not merely visionary. Already do we see the manifestation of the humane spirit in Japan's treatment of a captured foe, one of the highest marks of civilization, and one which so-called Christian nations sometimes fail to exercise.

There must be this practical preliminary work, industrial, social, civil and educational, before these strangely constituted people can be educated up to the point where they can grasp the sublime truths and doctrines of Christianity in their more spiritual aspect. And who will say this method is not rational and legitimate? And not being entirely without precedent in the history of the progress of Christianity, why should not this method commend itself to those having the management of our foreign missionary operations?

But in the conversion of the Japanese we have the foundation laid for the evangelization of the Chinese Empire. The common cause against Russia will bring them into the most sympathetic relations—not for the conquest of the world and the extermination of the white man, but for their own redemption nationally and spiritually, a greater and certainly a grander aim. But for Japan, China would be helpless in the clutches of the Russian Bear, and but for her measure of civilization Japan would be helpless, and but for Christianity Japan would not have had her civilization. China will be made to see through the eyes of Japan. It will not be a case of introducing Christianity into China, but of importation by China. As Japan looked east to America for light, so China will come to look east to Japan. The light of human progress has emanated from the east ever since the rise of the star of Bethlehem, and the first converts to the cause of Christianity came from those who went to see it, and not from it going to see them. And we submit that this must be the order of the greater evangelization—at least it must coöperate with the missionaries who would gladly carry the gospel to the uttermost parts of the earth. This is not only following along the line of least resistance, but upon the highway prepared by the strange forerunner of war and consequent higher civilization.

Let the Japanese, after having made such successful practical tests of our civilization as far as they have gone, go into the movement for a fuller adoption of the elements of which it is composed. They are already using our forms of money, and our business methods. And they are even contemplating the adoption of a state religion. Let them, while contemplating the latter movement, continue to introduce Western ideas. Let them imitate our forms of agriculture where beneficial, and use our implements and forms of warfare. Let them copy after our system of popular education. Let them adopt our legal forms and system of administering justice. Let them, as far as possible, assume a form of free government, national, provincial and municipal. Let them establish the most advanced ideas of commerce with other nations. Let them learn self-

development and self-dependence. Then will the work of the Christian missionary be easy, for it will be half done.

It is along these practical, industrial, commercial and civil lines that the Christian missionary must operate if he would be successful in the highest degree. And it is for this grand achievement that we believe the present war is preparatory.

The cry of the "Yellow Peril" is but the nightmare of the spirit of European despotism. It is, instead, the "Yellow Evangelization" that will follow as the result of the present war in the Orient.

But Russia will also be benefited. If she learns that war for self-aggrandizement is a failure, and meets no favor, she will have been repaid for all the great cost of her war. For this idea persisted in would mean her overthrow. It is contrary to the world-spirit of progress that this great nation should in the dawn of the twentieth century wage a successful war for territorial conquest, and swallow up one of the most intelligent, progressive and spectacular nations of the world. This would be reversing all the engines of modern-day progress, and setting the world back in history at least a hundred years. The wars of civilization have their only justification in the benefits which are to come to the conquered, not the conqueror. The freedom of Cuba, the great work inaugurated for the people of the Philippines and the new lease of life taken on by the effete and conquered Spain, are all in evidence as proof of this statement.

Russia has a few things to learn herself, after she has learned that the spirit of the age is self-development and not self-aggrandizement. She must remove her censorship of the press and both let her darkness out, and the light come in. No nation can advance in seclusion, especially when this seclusion is for the purpose of covering up some hideous internal deformity. She must abolish the assigning of criminals to the hellish mines of Siberia. The most exalted and fragrant flower of civilization is seen in the humanity shown the perverse criminal class. The barbarous treatment of criminals in those old countries does not mitigate crime, while it forever damns the criminal. More—it heathenizes the executioner. Russia must re-

move the ban from her Jewish subjects and treat them in the spirit of a common humanity. No oppressor nation can bide the light of this advanced age. It must modify or fall. This not only for the good of the Jew, but for the very life of Russia herself. Russia's greatest victory would be in defeat. If she is as alert to the trend of world-events as even Spain, she will soon realize the superior blessings which come from being defeated in a bad cause.

And if this good comes to Russia, and if our Swedish editor is correct in the line of sympathy he draws, then all those "powers that still oppress and hinder the progress of liberty and enlightenment," which he says are now aligned in sympathy on the side of Russia, must come in for their share of the lessons to be learned from the present conflict if they are to keep pace with the world's progress.

Instead of the "Yellow Curse," will come the "Yellow Blessing," not only to the "Yellow" race, but to all who are in need of the lessons to be learned from this Oriental conflict.

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### THE BIBLE AND RECENT ARCHÆOLOGICAL RESEARCH.

By REV. S. G. DORNBLASER, A.M.

The Bible is unique. It is indeed the Book of books. It was written by many authors—by holy men of God, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; and its composition covers a period of many centuries. Moreover, in it are recorded events of the remote past—events that relate to the very beginning of creation, and to the history of one nation in particular, with frequent reference to older and contemporary nations.

We are far removed from the times when even the most recent writings of inspiration were penned, the Old Testament volume having been completed twenty-three hundred years ago, and the New Testament probably eighteen hundred years ago. Consequently scholars have lacked positive knowledge concerning the attainments of those early nations in science, art and

literature; and concerning the manners and customs of the times.

This explains why portions of the Bible, especially parts of the Old Testament, have been contested ground. Believers have defended the Word, being firmly convinced that He who gave it to men made provision also for the proper recording and preservation of the same; while atheists and infidels have done all in their power to discredit the Bible by pointing out the inaccuracy and unreliability of those early recorders, inasmuch as, according to their statement, many of the things recorded could not possibly have been ascertained by man, and the art of writing was not known in the days of Abraham and Moses. Even the higher critics, many of them the professed friends of the Bible, have attempted to undermine and destroy much of what our forefathers accepted as the very word of God, and have caused some good people to fear and tremble as to the ultimate results of their work. The question, "What is left of the Old Bible?" has been seriously discussed in some quarters in recent years.

Bible students, however, have great reason to rejoice because of recent archaeological discoveries which have been made in Babylon, Assyria, Egypt, Palestine and elsewhere, which confirm and supplement what is contained in the Book of Inspiration.

Monuments, rocks, inscriptions, monoliths, obelisks, funeral tablets, temples, statues, bricks, coins, papyrus rolls, seals, pottery—all add their quota to the confirmation of the correctness of the Bible record. "From all these sources," says Dr. Nicol, "materials have been gathered which have made it possible to recover the ancient languages of Egypt and Babylon, to determine the worship and belief of these ancient peoples, and to reconstruct the history of more than one vanished empire."\* "Light is shed upon the Scripture story from all sides \* \*

The monuments have done much of recent years to restore the diminishing credit of the Scripture writers, because they

\* Nicol, p. 4, *Recent Explorations in Bible Lands.*

have shown what a wealth of material was in existence for accurate history."\*

"Many a perplexing and obscure passage in the Bible has been made clear" by these recent discoveries \* \* "and we have indisputable evidence of the substantial accuracy of the historical statements of the Scriptures."†

"Archæology more often supplements than confirms history. It either speaks when history is silent, or if it speaks of the same person or event, it speaks in such a way that \* \* when the whole of the evidence, monumental and literary, has been focussed, so to speak, upon the event or personage under discussion, the result is a vividness of realization, a certainty of conviction which no other means can attain."‡

"The spade," wrote Oliver Wendell Holmes in 1884, "has provided mankind water, coal, iron and gold. And now it is giving them truth—the means of which have never been opened till our times."§

More than a century ago Voltaire declared that "the Old Testament is purely legendary, and without corroboration in secular history." With the facts then at hand, he could not be as successfully contradicted as he could be now.

Ernest Renan and others have asserted that intellectual culture and the art of writing were not known in the time of Abraham and Moses, and these writers have concluded that the books of the Bible, supposed to have been produced at that time, could not have been written so early. There is, however, in these days abundant material on hand successfully to answer these and like objectors.

God in His providence has caused these wonderful discoveries to be made at a time when they are most needed—when destructive criticism is boldest in its unwarranted assertions.

Discoveries of greater or less value were made among the ruins of Babylon and Assyria several centuries ago. As early

\* Nicol, p. 62.

† Chapman, *Intro.*, p. 3. *Mounds, Monuments and Inscriptions.*

‡ Nicol, p. 62.

§ *Hom. Rev.*, May, 1904, p. 357.

as 1625 inscribed bricks and cuneiform characters were found in Babylon and sent to Europe.\*

Not until about the beginning of the 19th century, however, was there much progress made toward the scientific translation of these ancient inscriptions. In 1802 George Frederick Grotefend, a German scholar under thirty years of age, discovered the method of reading the Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions. His discovery was of no immediate value, because the eminent men of his day declined to sanction the publication of what he wrote. Not until 1893 were his original papers rediscovered and published.

Sir Henry Rawlinson, an officer of the British army, thirty years after Grotefend's discoveries (in 1835) became interested in the decipherment of Persian inscriptions, and, almost independent of the German scholar's work, reached the same results by similar methods. Grotefend made some progress in discovering an alphabet; but Rawlinson was able to accomplish still more along this line.†

Prof. Hilprecht designates Claudius James Rich of England as "the first methodical explorer and surveyor of Babylonian and Assyrian ruins and rivers." In 1811 he made his first visit to Babylon, at which time he took accurate measurements of the ruins, and gave correct descriptions of what he saw and discovered. For ten years he gave much time and thought to archaeological investigation, and succeeded in laying a foundation upon which others in after years built.‡

Sir Austen Henry Layard, about the middle of last century (1845-1877), was also a most enthusiastic explorer of the ruins in and about Nineveh. He made three different excursions to the East, each time spending several years there, and exposing himself to great inconvenience and hardships. The inhospitable climate and the poor shelter afforded him during the rainy season undermined his health. Besides, he had to contend

\* Hilprecht, p. 17. *Explorations in Bible Lands during 19th Century.*

† Hilprecht, pp. 23, 24. Chapman, pp. 6, 7.

‡ Hilprecht, pp. 26-34.



with the opposition of rulers, and the superstition of the inhabitants of that country. They were not willing at first to have him dig into the mounds. Overcoming this difficulty, he discovered many tablets, monuments and statues of great value. Without being able to read the inscriptions, he could after a time determine the meaning of much that he discovered.

The greatest strides in archæological research, however, have been made during the last two or three decades. Previous to this time, the work was carried on largely by individuals who made the subject a study. Lack of money greatly hindered the progress of the explorers. In recent years, however, governments and institutions of learning have manifested a commendable interest in the subject.

The Palestine Exploration Fund was established in 1865; The American Society for Palestine Exploration in 1870; The Egyptian Exploration Fund in 1883; The Babylonian Exploration Fund in 1888, under the auspices of the University of Penna. This institution under the direction of Prof. Hilprecht has been pushing forward the work with great energy and success.

We note below some of the important discoveries made:

"THE ROSETTA STONE."

During Napoleon's invasion of Egypt in 1799, a large, black granite slab, covered with inscriptions, was found by a French engineer near Rosetta, a few miles from Alexandria. This is known as the "Rosetta Stone." The inscriptions on the stone are in Greek, and the hieroglyphic or priest-cast language, and the Demotic or speech of the common people. Greek scholars soon discovered that these three inscriptions referred to the same event, viz, a decree in honor of Ptolemy V Epiphanes. Careful comparison of the inscriptions enabled students to ascertain the meaning of the hieroglyphic signs, and to formulate an alphabet of the common Egyptian language. Thus was discovered a key to Egyptian writing, and the science of Egyptology could be intelligently pursued. The "Rosetta Stone" is in the British Museum in London and is highly valued.\*

\* Hilprecht, p. 629. Chapman, pp. 4, 5.

## THE MOABITE STONE.

In 1868 the Rev. F. Klein, a German missionary, discovered in Moab, near Diban, the famous Moabite Stone, on which king Mesha perpetuated his great exploits. The stone is black basalt, almost four feet high, two feet wide and fourteen inches thick, and contains an inscription of thirty-four lines in Phœnician script. The Rev. Klein purchased the stone for the Berlin Museum, but the French government, also being desirous of obtaining it, offered a large price for it. The controversy that followed led the Turkish authorities to believe that the stone was very valuable and they were unwilling to give it up. The ignorant people built a fire under it, and while in a heated condition poured water over it and broke it to pieces. Fortunately an impression of the writing was taken before the stone was shattered, and most of the fragments also were gathered and put together again, so that part of it can be read in its original form. The fragments of the stone are in the Paris Museum, and a plaster cast in the British Museum. Dr. Chapman says: "This is not only the oldest Hebrew literary monument in existence, but the most ancient specimen of Semitic alphabet writing accessible to us."\*

The inscription on this stone relates to the conflict between Moab on the one hand, and Israel and Judah on the other, and is a confirmation of II Kings, 3d chapter. In this inscription the name of Jehovah occurs in the same form in which it is found in the Bible.

If the king of Moab left a record of his deeds in stone, may it not be possible that other records will yet be discovered concerning the acts of the kings of Israel and Judah? †

## TEL-EL-AMARNA TABLETS.

Tel-el-Amarna is a small town in Egypt, 170 miles south of Cairo, on the River Nile. In 1887 Egyptian peasants digging for relics, to sell to travelers, discovered three hundred or more little tablets covered with cuneiform inscriptions in the Babylon-

\*Chapman, p. 103. Hilprecht, pp. 611, 612.

† Hilprecht, pp. 611-613. Nicol, pp. 37, 38.

ian language. These tablets are of clay and vary in size from about two inches square, to five by nine inches.

Written on them are official letters and reports to Amenophis III, and IV, rulers of Egypt, from governors of Palestine, Babylon, and elsewhere, about 1400 B. C.

The history of Palestine during the sojourn of Israel in Egypt is not given in the Bible; but from these reports of the governors to the kings in Egypt, to whom they were subject, we gain no little knowledge of events in that day. We learn what was the condition of the promised land before Israel's return from Egyptian bondage.

We have in these tablets abundant proof of the fact that the art of writing was known in the time of Moses—a fact which critics have denied. Dr. Hilprecht asserts that writing was in regular use in Babylon as early as 4000 B. C.\*

Reference is made in these tablets to Melchizedek "king of Salem, and priest of the most high God," thus throwing some light on this character whose origin is not revealed in Scripture. The Tel-el-Amarna Tablets are distributed among the museums at Berlin, London and Cairo.

#### MISCELLANEOUS DISCOVERIES.

Tablets have been discovered in Assyria and Babylonia confirming the Bible account of creation, the temptation and fall of man, the deluge, the tower of Babel, and laws concerning the Sabbath.†

The Assyrian tablets reveal the fact that each king of this land kept an accurate account of the events of his reign. Almost all the references in the Bible to these Assyrian rulers and their works, are confirmed by the recently discovered documents, so that the history of Assyria is well known apart from and independent of the Bible. For example, King Sennacherib's invasion of Palestine, and his capture of the cities of Judah and King Hezekiah, II Kings 18 : 13 ff, is related more fully

\* Hilprecht, p. 253.

† Chapman, chapters II and III.

in the annals of the Assyrian kings, than in the inspired volume.\*

Critics have rejected the Biblical statement that Mannasseh, king of Israel, when captured by the Assyrian king, was carried in chains to Babylon (II Chron, 33 : 11), on the grounds that Babylon had been destroyed by Sennacherib, and that Nineveh was then the Assyrian capital. But the excavated records show that Sennacherib's son and successor, Esar-haddon, rebuilt Babylon and made it his capital instead of Niveveh.†

The campaign of Chedorlaomer with three vassal kings against Canaan, Gen. XIV., is no invention, as the critics have claimed, but is an historical fact. Inscriptions recently discovered prove it to be accurate history. The objection of critics that Palestine was not known in this early day falls to the ground. It was known long before this time.‡

A Babylonian code of civil laws was discovered in 1892, compiled by a king who was contemporary with Abraham. M. de Morgan disinterred it from the ruins of Susa. The laws were drawn up "by Khammu-rabi, the Amraphel of the book of Genesis, for his Babylonian subjects."

Critics have asserted that a code of laws could not have been compiled as early as the time of Moses, since the people were not sufficiently cultured to write. But this Babylonian code was compiled hundreds of years before Moses' time. Between the Babylonian code and the Mosaic law, there are points of similarity and also points of difference. The Babylonian code is civil and secular, the Mosaic code is moral. The Babylonian code is for a people advanced in civilization ; the Mosaic code is for a people in a more primitive condition.§

In Egypt thousands, perhaps millions of mummies, have been buried, and with them inscribed tablets, written documents on papyrus leather. Some of these tombs have been opened and have been the source of much information. Others re-

\*Chapman, p. 86, 87.

†Chapman, p. 90.

‡Chapman, p. 51, 52.

§Hom. Rev., March, 1904, p. 170.

main yet to be opened, and doubtless further discoveries will be made.\*

The records of Egypt confirm the Bible account of the king gathering corn during the years of plenty and of the existence of a famine of long duration after the years of plenty.†

In the treasure cities or store houses built of brick, there has been this remarkable discovery made: The lower courses of brick are made of clay and straw; higher up reeds are substituted for straw; and the last courses are pure clay without straw, thus confirming the Bible account.‡

The manuscript of the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" was found in Constantinople in 1875. This document gives the doctrines of the early Church and contains many quotations from the New Testament. From this we gain a better knowledge of primitive Christianity.§

The wilderness of Sinai has also been explored, and important information gained concerning the giving of the Law to Moses, and concerning the wanderings of Israel during their forty years' sojourn.||

As recent as 1892 the Syriac Gospels were discovered in the convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai. In this same convent Tischendorf found the Codex Sinaiticus. The Syriac Gospels are written in the Aramaic language, the language used by Christ and the apostles. "With very few exceptions this Syriac Gospel is identical with the authorized version of the Scriptures."¶

Already the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, has sent out four or five expeditions to explore the ruins of Babylonia. The first went in 1888-1889, discovered 2,000 inscriptions; the second in 1889-1890, discovered 8,000 inscriptions; the third in 1893-1896, discovered 21,000 cuneiform inscriptions; the fourth in 1898-1900, when a whole library was dis-

\* Chapman, p. 112.

† Chapman, pp. 130, 131.

‡ Chapman, pp. 139, 140.

§ Chapman, pp. 187, 188.

|| Nicol, p. 27.

¶ Chapman, p. 186.

covered. The operations of this institution have been confined almost wholly to mounds at Nippur, about 25 miles south-east of Babylon.

Among the most important discoveries yet made is that of the Temple Library at Nippur, by Prof. Hilprecht in 1898. Already nearly 90,000 documents have been taken from the rooms, all of them dating back 4,000 or 5,000 B. C. When these have been translated they will throw much light upon Babylonian civilization and religion. This library seems to have been arranged in an orderly manner, according to subjects; mathematical works being in one section, astronomy in another, linguistics in another and religions in another. In that early day they had the multiplication table up to 1350.\*

Some have attempted to belittle the work of archæology, by asserting that after all much of it is guess work. But tests have been made, by submitting the same inscriptions to different experts, who have translated independently of each other, and the results have been satisfactory. In other words Archæology is a science, and the various languages and hieroglyphic signs can be almost as accurately translated as the Hebrew or Greek or Latin.

Latest archæological discovery is overthrowing many of the theories of destructive criticism. More than that, it is coming to the support of the inspired Word in such a way as to more firmly establish it in the mind and heart of mankind.

Future discoveries will doubtless give us a still clearer knowledge of the Word of God, will tend to brighten the faith of all who accept the truth, and will lead multitudes to believe in the only true God and in Jesus Christ whom He has sent.

\* Hilprecht, pp. 529, 531.

## ARTICLE IX.

## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

## I.

## ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

BY REV. M. COOVER, A.M.

Causes detaining men from church-going have employed many a pen during the past decade. It is not a begging of the question to say that the summary of causes brings the resultant which named politely is imperfection of judgment. But this imperfection is voluntary and self-complacent, and voluntary imperfection, however polite, is sin.

After all the extenuating circumstances of needed rest for the toiling masses, and charges against the Church being an obsolete and useless organization, the concensus of views is the statement that it is man's selfish self-satisfied imperfect heart that counsels him to stay away. Never has the Christian pulpit been so intelligent and comprehensive as we find it in the present age. Never in the world's history of industry have men had shorter hours of labor than they have today. Never has physical energy had to sacrifice itself less for the maintenance of life in meeting bodily necessities.

The circumstances of the social and industrial world today instead of excusing the non-religious, incriminate them for the neglect of duties and advantages for which the largest opportunities are now proffered for their exercise and enjoyment.

And instead of the Christian Church being an effete and useless organization through incompetence and failure, no other organization does anything comparable to it for society, or furnishes but the smallest quota of the elevating instruction given by the modern pulpit. Not only religious instruction, but a vast amount of associative information on all subjects useful to life, finds its way to the people through the Church.

There was a time when professors of scientific instruction

were antagonistic to religion, and when clergymen were suspicious of scientific knowledge as subversive of morals and the facts of revelation. But now our leading scientists are Christians, and the few who are not avowed Christians are at least theists.

Our leading pulpits likewise are no longer suspicious of true science. With scientific spirit the Book of Nature is seen to be in no wise a negation of the Book of Life and Revelation. The two books rightly read are harmonious. Neither on the ground of the lack of intelligence, or of uselessness, can the non-church going population base its excuse.

It is partial knowledge that results in imperfect judgment. There are men who are competent only of half-digestion of the great facts of science, men who are capable of penetrating but a little way into the intricacies of scientific attainments, who also are superficial in their opinion of religion. Not being able to weigh many facts and hold in view many relations for the comprehension of an important subject, the partially informed mind can see only antagonism where the clear and comprehensive mind can trace adjustment and continuity.

Once science belonged to the coterie, while religion was left to its isolated sphere for the less informed. But information of all kinds is now penetrating society, and an imperfect comprehension of the established facts of science finds a motley crowd that eagerly apes after the new without the power of discerning the right relation of the new to the old. There was a time when but little of the great meaning of the Bible was known to any save the professional clergyman. To the multitude the Bible was a revered book, but not deeply understood. But now the world is sharing a common knowledge of the truths of revelation and its relation to moral duties. Doctrines and moral precepts, divine purposes and human duties have become things generally understood by the people.

But religion is not an isolated sphere of knowledge, not a department of life out of relation to the facts of physical being.

There is, after all the distribution of general Biblical knowledge, but a partial comprehension of the great meaning enfolded in Biblical revelation, and likewise but a partial compre-



hension of the truths of science. The true perception of the relation of the two is not in the possession of the many. But from this partialness of knowledge there not infrequently arises a blatant profession of knowing it all, and of criticising all realms of truth and of weighing them adequately by what is but a partial comprehension. No man is now a competent judge in any branch of science unless he is a specialist in that department. Not even an academic education qualifies a man to be a judge of things either scientific or religious. The University in its elective courses, and the higher departments of the theological school, educate their specialists who alone are qualified to deal adequately with the subjects on which men now think so deeply.

The theologian does not give his *ipse dixit* on biology, nor does the biologist proclaim his *fiat* respecting religion.

The clergyman turns to the ripest knowledge of the specialist in science for adequate information in respect of the forms and functions of physical life; and the material scientist looks to the studied theologian and specialist in the realm of ethics for the ripest views of the moral and spiritual manifestations and capabilities of mankind.

Now what does this signify? It manifests this condition of men growing in intelligence, that men comprehending in part the truths of both science and religion, their manual and intellectual activities being diverse and general rather than specific, and not being adequate judges of the real import of a science which has become popular, are beginning to be of doubtful mind in respect of religious verities. They are not able to grasp the full meaning of what science teaches, nor fully to penetrate the meaning of what religion teaches, and yet become judges of the value of the Church as a religious institution. What religion really is and stands for, what it has accomplished for the world and man, is a history which they have not learned, and yet from their incompetent comprehension they criticise the Church, become doubters of its usefulness and necessity, and grow callous to religious sentiments, and are not certain of anything as to the real meaning of life. It is imperfect knowledge suggesting and substantiating sentiments that satisfy

the desires of men unwilling to acquiesce in the demands of a true religious faith. Thus a socialism is arising with a creedless dependence on doing what each man may deem to be right in a utilitarian sense, and letting the rest go. Ripe comprehension is the business of the few who make the various departments of learning a specialty, and should be the guides of thought to the public, while doubt and suspicion of all things can easily be the property of all minds.

Mr. John Fiske, a critic of general science in America, and Mr. John George Romanes, a representative of the ripest thought in the pursuit of science in England, turned from their waverings of religious faith by a deeper comprehension of the meaning of life as taught by the revelations of science, and distinctly declare that nature does not prove that death ends all, but that inferences are abundant that faith in a spiritual existence after bodily death is a fact to be accepted without the positive proof of demonstration.

The ordinary mind fails to appreciate the fact that moral and spiritual truths are not subject to mathematical demonstration.

God and the human soul cannot be handled as objects of physical examination. To await a demonstrative proof of the existence of God is to be under a delusion. Because theology does not come forth with a palpable demonstration of the being and personality of God, and an incontrovertibly demonstrated proof of the immortality of man, it seems to the ill-advised that there is a positive uncertainty of the truths taught in the Bible. Things that are material in their structure, relations of things, such as space and time, are capable of measurement and can be computed by numbers and undergo demonstration. But that which is impalpable, that which is spiritual and affects character, and motives, is not subject to calculation in figures nor proof by demonstration. The syllogisms of inference may be stronger than the demonstrations of number, and to the intelligent mind may be more convincing than demonstrated proof.

It is not the acute reasoner in philosophy, nor the penetrating mind in science, that denies the need of God and of Religious faith, but the superficial and incompetent thinker who

does not know enough to realize that he knows nothing adequately.

This superficial knowledge has penetrated widely into men's notions, and has affected their ideas of religion and the Church.

Their lack of sincere moral conviction results in flabby character and immature judgment.

The Church stands for the ideals of the noblest moral and spiritual attainment. That which shows us to be above mere animal life is the refined and lofty spiritual susceptibility of our sensitive moral nature. The beautiful, the true and the good, the hungering aspirations of the human soul in its search for the satisfying ideal, do not find their embodiment in the surging mass of social superficialness, nor in the sentiments of the easy going moral world. The world's aspirations are material; but the sublime ideals of the beautiful in character, the good in sympathy and the true in worth, are spiritual and belong to the reflective consciousness.

There must be something to turn men's minds to the fact that they are more than things, more than something to move in the train of superficial and illusive events, and then go out in the darkness of unconscious being.

There must be something to warn the wicked and reprove the wrong-doer besides the systems of social and penal law. There must be something to encourage the honest toiler and well-doer besides the mere consciousness that he is honest and industrious. To follow in the path which leads to the morally beautiful requires both incentive and restraint that is efficient. The Church presents in its teaching that something which the world does not teach, holds up to men that ideal of righteous character, and presents that spiritual power which makes operative the effort of attainment. The Church holds up to the world, though reflected in man's dull perceptibility as in a mirror darkly, the face of Jesus Christ, with lineaments of moral grace and spiritual beauty, a picture which no human artist can paint, in lines of moral strength, in colors of sympathetic tenderness, which no creation of man could ever conceive or execute.

God reveals himself through Christ in the sacred teaching

and consciousness of the Church, and the Church is the institution which keeps ever before the world in its sin-stained consciousness the remembrance that there is a beautiful in character, that there is a sublime in sentiment, that there is a moral grace that exalts and refines and makes life worth living. With a consciousness made susceptible of the noblest ideal will be the accompanying sense of the lack of approximate attainment of the virtues which that consciousness embodies. Desire comes with the right conception of the beautiful, and the unsatisfied desire will urge to acquiescence in the way of its realization. What though the existence of that God who presents these lofty thoughts and aspirations, these ideals and the incarnation of all their properties and powers in the person of Jesus Christ, cannot be proved by syllogisms and demonstrated by figures, believe him to be and trust him to do, as science believes and trusts, basing its action on faith in the best working hypothesis which explains better than any other the facts that are manifest.

The greatest and most wide-reaching systems of science rest not on absolutely proved statements, but upon hypotheses which developed into a theory best explain that which on that basis can be proved.

The denial of God and of the statements of Revelation is not the verdict of knowledge, but an assertion through lack of knowledge.

Agnosticism is simply a confession of limitations imposed on the human mind. Science can no more prove that there is no God and no immortality for man, than Christianity can prove by demonstration that God and human immortality are realities. On the mere plane of reason, apart from divine revelation, the best working hypothesis for the explanation of all related facts of moral as well as of physical nature, takes in God as an indispensable factor.

This is faith on its lowest terms, a faith reached through reflective consciousness. With sin-blinded eyes we can see but few things rightly. But the mind susceptible to the morally beautiful and imperative will find light coming into the path of its aspiration. The Light of the World will illumine the faith

of the man who seeks to walk in the light. We are not asked to believe blindly, but to believe trustingly. Now we know but in part, and can solve riddles only so far as we comprehend the rules. A period of enlightenment always precedes the era of reformation. The partial glimpses of men into God's world, and the imperfect and confusing perceptions which create doubt and indifference in the minds of the people more eager for ease and exemption than for truth, will widen into more positive and exact truth as the world's intelligence is more enriched by ever disseminating knowledge. The dogmatic in religion is yielding daily to the ethical, which in its turn, when rightly apprehended, will produce an equally spiritual and divine doctrine. The reins are loose till the way becomes certain. The mind is naturally inquisitive and truth searching, and will finally acquiesce in the truth as related and possible to human limitations.

He that willeth to do the will of righteousness shall come to the knowledge of the truth. God will shine into every heart that is open, and will open every heart that does not resist the truth.

## II. GERMAN.

BY REV. S. GRING HEFELBOWER.

Prof. Baumgarten, of Kiel, published a stout pamphlet last Spring on the chief problems in preaching the Gospel to-day, which has called forth many comments, some favorable and some unfavorable. Perhaps the chief difficulty that confronts the Christian minister at present is the disparity between the biblical material and the modern way of thinking; it is so difficult to express our experiences in biblical forms of thought. Our modern Christian consciousness has grown away from the primitive form found in the Bible, and must assume a different attitude to many problems that confront the Christian of the present day—an attitude which is impossible for the biblical forms. Prof. Baumgarten's statements can be interpreted in such a way as will meet with approval by almost everybody, but his own intended meaning is very negative. His ideal ser-

mon would be a religious discourse with almost all of the Gospel left out.

Drews, in a pamphlet on *The Sermon in the 19th Century*, gives a most interesting history of preaching from the time of Pietism and Illumination down to the present, treating only the subjects that the preachers in these various periods chose for their sermons. All of this extensive and valuable setting is for practical rather than for historical ends.

\* \* \* \* \*

Prof. Seeberg, of Berlin, in a review of certain recent publications on the history of Protestant theology in the period of the Reformation, which appeared in the September number of the *Theologische Rundschau*, adds certain comments of his own, the whole of which we give slightly condensed.

Kropatscheck, in his discussion of *Occam and Luther*, called attention to the contrast between the two as to their conception of the authority of Scripture. With the former the Bible has authority in the legal sense, but with the latter the authority of God's Word is experienced inwardly, hence it is living and life-giving.

Preuss, in a 102 page pamphlet on *The Development of the Scripture Principle with Luther until the Leipzig Disputation*, observes, that during the period before his controversy concerning Indulgences Luther gave up the authority of the scholastics and Aristotle; during the controversy he yielded the authority of the Pope, church rulers and councils. In this he was guided, not by theoretical demands, but by the results of practical developments.

Both Kropatscheck and Preuss agree in defining Luther's conception of the authority of scripture as religious. But in his writings the purely legalistic conception of the authority of scripture appears to be present along with the theory of inspiration of the Middle Ages. Is this a "flagrant contradiction," as Harnack thinks? Prof. Walther, of Rostock, with his usual mastery of the subject and with his usual clearness, has subjected the entire problem to a new investigation. First, he shows that, according to Luther, the Old and New Testaments stand in an organic relation to each other. His further dis-

cussion leads to the conclusion that Luther assumed a double sense in which Christians held the scripture; first, in the sense of an experienced inner authority, and, second, as an external authority which is necessary for the use of the former. The latter form of belief in scripture is, "for him who belongs to the Christian Church, normally the preliminary step for attaining saving faith." However, we must go beyond this first step. The testimony of the Spirit in scripture effects the religious experience of the truth of scripture, and thereby free personal subjection to its authority. The latter is the goal, but the way to it leads through the external subjection to the authority of scripture. The religious content (Christ) is the real content of scripture. And also in this we can agree with Walther, that for Luther and in general for the Christian Scripture comes into consideration first of all as an external authority. Consider, for instance, children and those who are not educated, or Luther's use of scripture in theological and ecclesiastical disputations. But Seeberg thinks that this does not solve the pending problem. We can acknowledge that, as elsewhere in life, external authorities normally appear first, also scripture has taken and takes first of all this position in the training of individuals and peoples, but that this in no way prejudicates acknowledgement that this position of scripture, according to its peculiarities, rests on its experienced authority. And we can go farther and assert that, since Luther had not emphasized the latter as the external legal authority, his attitude to scripture is certainly divided, in so far as he had conceived of its authority on the one hand as externally given, and on the other, as internally experienced. Although a person may practically accept and even follow Luther's procedure, the question concerning the justification of his procedure is not solved thereby. And the attitude to this problem is of greatest importance, not merely for our historical knowledge of Luther's system, but also for the practical determination of the ends in view when using Bible authority.

O. Scheel, in his pamphlet of 1902 on *Luther's Attitude to Holy Scripture*, discusses the whole problem and gives an excellent presentation of its present status. He shows that

Luther came to his recognition of the scripture from his religious experience, to which Seeberg assents, but he rejects Scheel's criticism of his (Seeberg's) position when he asserted that he taught that Luther's conception of the content of scripture was Christ—merely Christ, and not also sin and grace. But this is without meaning, for Luther's well-known conception of Christ included both. With him recognizing Christ never means anything else than recognizing Him in relation to sin and grace.

When Scheel refers to Luther's frequently expressed doctrine of inspiration he thinks that he cannot escape establishing a contradiction in his teaching. But Seeberg claims that this judgment goes too far. With Luther's conception of faith the new view of scripture is essentially given. In so far as scripture works faith, or the Spirit in the Word gives witness of itself, is it authority. If the Spirit comes through the scripture, the scripture is through the Spirit. The range of the latter determines the range of the former. The *testimonium spiritus sancti* does not exclude but includes the idea of inspiration, however it determines the range and thereby the kind of inspiration. The freedom, which Luther assumed in relation to the historical material of the scripture, proves that these thoughts express the fundamental motives in his understanding of the authority of scripture. Thereby is not denied that theoretically his view remained incomplete, since, on the one hand, he can occasionally speak as if he merely repeated the old verbal inspiration, and since he, on the other hand, produced no theoretically clear norm for his historical criticism. From the former we see developed the view of Harnack and Scheel, from the latter that of Walther. From the theoretical imperfection in Luther we can understand the genesis of the Protestant doctrine of inspiration, which goes back to Calvin. And from this, on the basis of the *testimonium spiritus sancti*, they came to the inspiration and infallibility of the books in every word.

One thing more deserves mention. Since Luther, on the basis of his conception of faith, taught that the Spirit was present not only in the word of scripture but also in the preached word, there arose the question concerning the special character



of the word of scripture as over against the preached word. Even concerning this there can be found no thorough theoretical discussion in Luther's writings. But the matter is simple. Scripture, as the pure source of revelation, is at the same time the norm of all doctrine of the Church. It is from the Spirit and from it the Spirit goes to the preached word, hence the Spirit in the latter must attest itself by the word of scripture.

\* \* \* \* \*

More and more attention is being paid to church architecture. Some years ago a monumental work was published by Fr. X. Kraus, a distinguished Roman Catholic historian. Another capital work is that of the Protestant Superintendent, Richard Bürkner, 1903. This work is both historical and didactic. Naturally the author divides his work into three parts: Christian Antiquity, the Middle Ages, Modern Times. The author tells us that "in the first centuries the characteristics of ancient Rome prevailed, but later the old Christian elements, which were subjected to a special development, but in both instances the Oriental influence was so strong that a peculiar technical language arose." The cloister-life of the Middle Ages exerted great influence on ecclesiastical architecture. "The union of the spiritual and worldly aristocracy and German spirit, fidelity to tradition joined to the free movement of the individual—these especially find expression in the Romanesque architecture, which 'in grandeur and beauty is not surpassed by any other.'" Gothic art arose in France, but was accepted in all countries and in Germany was most fondly developed. "The Gothic cathedrals are the chief strongholds of the clergy-scholasticism in Stone." The Gothic cathedral turned the beholder toward the infinite, as in literature Mysticism stands close to Scholasticism.

In the *Renaissance*, the Italian spirit found its expression in art. Not so in Germany. Here not beauty, but the truthful and the useful were the goal of effort. Dürer, Halbein, Cranach, Vischer gave expression to the German spirit. Here comes in the frescuing and other masterpieces of the brush that beautify so many European churches. Rubens and Rembrandt are the masters in this department of church art.

The last third of this exceedingly valuable book is chiefly didactic. It would serve well as a book of instruction in art. As we have nothing to correspond to it in English, it ought to be translated. If the principles of ecclesiastical art were better understood among us, we would not have so many nondescript churches, so many churches that are ill adapted to the execution of the Lutheran fundamental principle in worship—the preaching of the divine Word—and building committees would not be at the mercy of architects.

---

## ARTICLE X.

### REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

*The Fatherhood of God.* By A. Lincoln Shute, A.M., (Cornell Coll.) B.D. (Drew), Member of the Rock River Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Introduction by Bishop Stephen M. Merrill, D.D., LL.D. New York: Eaton & Mains, Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye.

The aim of the author of this neat volume of 310 pages is to show that the Scripture teaching requires us to limit the application of the "Fatherhood of God" to those who have attained spiritual sonship through redemptive justification and regeneration. It seems to have been prompted by the increasing tendency to emphasize the universal natural sonship of all men as the basis of the generic brotherhood of all, and its tendency to foster reliance on such natural sonship in disregard of the necessity of the real and true spiritual sonship to which the gospel calls men. There is certainly abundant reason in our day for guarding men against dependence upon God's creational Fatherhood, as having made man in His own "image" for the lofty fellowship of true children, when the spirit and life of sonship are utterly wanting. And the author has done a good service in emphasizing the truth that the only sonship for which the redemptive work stands and the gospel is given is that which is reached only through the new life in Jesus Christ. We are not prepared, however, to say that he has succeeded in showing it to be out of place to recognize a natural Fatherhood of God in His creative work. Men have endowments that relate them to Him in filial obligation, endowments that define and express the very purpose of their existence. This truth adds force to the call of the gospel, as they are now under an economy of redemptive love and grace provided to enable them to actualize the spiritual purpose and possibilities of the existence given them. The true sonship for which God creates is not realized in a life of sinfulness and sin; and the su-

preme significance of redemption and the gospel is that men sin against even God's creative Fatherhood, when they refuse the redemptive grace which is necessary to actualize its sublime and loving purpose. The author's discussion will serve to emphasize this great truth.

M. VALENTINE.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY.

*Words of Koheleth.* By John Franklin Genung. Pp. xiv, 316; \$1.25 net; postage extra.

Modern biblical literature has tended so strongly in the direction of a criticism at once severe and cold that an interpretation of a book of the Bible, conceived in a spirit so constructive, and vitalized by a sympathy so intelligent as we find in this volume on the Book of Ecclesiastes, is warmly welcomed. This puzzling book of the Old Testament, which Renan has chosen to regard as the only really charming book ever written by a Jew, finds in the present-day attitude towards the problems of life its native atmosphere. An age which has turned to Omar Khayyam almost as to one bringing it a new gospel cannot fail to discover in Koheleth a kindred spirit. In each is the same uncompromising attitude towards life, the stern, insistent questioning of its meaning and issue, the unwillingness to permit the "credit" to form a stronger motive than the "cash."

In this author's view Ecclesiastes is permeated with the modern scientific spirit. It gathers all the facts, views them with thorough-going impartiality, and makes its induction uninfluenced by preconceived ideas. This in a measure explains why of the books of the Bible it should make a strong appeal to us today. Then, too, an inquiry conducted in this spirit must needs issue in a result satisfactory, if any can, to the modern mind, since winning its goal, no truce is made with the evidence—or shall we say, the lack of evidence. It is the courageous attitude which dares to look the worst squarely in the face and wrest from it what is of true worth.

As to what this is which is of true worth, this "cash" as Omar calls it, or as Koheleth puts it, this "profit" a man hath "of all his labor which he taketh under the sun"—the ancientest problem of all—we find these two-fold questioners, who strongly resemble each other in their demand for a fine foundation of knowledge on which to rest their lessons, and in that fascinating tinge of melancholy which pervades their writings, widely differing. In the interpretation of this phase of Ecclesiastes the present work is admirable. The author rejects the view that the book is a compilation or the result of the glosses of various editors upon some original work, but rigorously contends that there is internal evidence of its unity. Throughout, he claims, it is conceived in the light of one strong, central idea, around which all else, no matter how seemingly inconsistent, is grouped in due relation. The difficulty of establishing this theorem is

admitted, but the argument is sustained with convincing power and the conclusion is reached that the teaching of the book, instead of being negative as is too often half admitted by Koheleth's interpreters, instead of being epicurean with Omar Khayyam, as a superficial rendering of some of its passages might seem to imply, finds its complete expression in a noble and positive creed, a creed which is suggested at the outset of the book, is developed as the thought progresses and is carried through to a triumphant end.

Confirmation of this position is found in the historical setting which the author for reasons not devoid of cogency, assumes, and in the new divisions of the book which are adopted. In this latter matter he is particularly happy. It is, of course, the fashion for the commentator of to-day to fix for himself the divisions of the thought which he conceives proper, but we have seldom met with an instance where it is done with so much advantage as in this case and where it savors so little of artificiality.

A charming translation with valuable notes is appended to the general discussion of Koheleth's thought.

P. M. BIKLE.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY, BOSTON.

Rich as the September *Atlantic* was in choice papers, fiction and poetry, the October and November numbers promise to surpass it. They will contain notable articles and stories. Among them will be an article by H. D. Sedgwick on The Coup d'Etat of 1960; Translations of the Bible; The Closed Shop; Christina Rossetti; Machinery and English Style; Sir Walter Scott; A Clipper Ship and her Commander; Freight Car Experiences and The Thames are among the articles which will appear in the next two numbers. A very unusual collection of fiction has been made for these numbers. Among those who have contributed to it are Will Payne, Sewell Ford, Ellen Duvall, Emery Pottle, Mrs. Grace Ellery Channing-Stetson, Katherine M. Roof, Charles D. Stewart and Helen Sterling Thomas. The issues of the presidential campaign will be treated by the leading Republicans, Democrats and Independents best qualified to write with authority on the matters and principles at issue.

